

BEFORE THE DE JURE

FEDERAL COURT VIA UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES [Pursuant to Art. III,
Section 1-2, Constitution of the United States for America
In The Western District of Michigan [Art. 1, § 2, Clause 3, Art 4, § 4]

In re The United States of North America; sovereign state Republican form government.
a/k/a The United States of America. The United States Government belonging to the Family of Nations.
The Preamble and Constitutional. United States of America. Union Republic of America.

CASE RECORD NUMBER

Lower court file:

LOWER COURT FILE:

=

REDRESS CONSTITUTIONAL GRIEVANCES
CONSTITUTIONAL COURT COUNTERCLAIMS FOR RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

Petitioner/Suitor in Private Capacity
Carolyn-jean, Sui Juris
1451 Lake Drive Southeast Suite 68641
Grand Rapids Michigan 49516

Vs

Defendant 1
STATE OF MICHIGAN
525 W. Ottawa St. Lansing, MI 48906 517-335-7622

Defendant 2
CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS
180 Ottawa Avenue NW Suite 1200 Grand Rapids, Michigan 49503 (616) 456-3388

Defendant 3
GRAND RAPIDS POLICE DEPARTMENT, et al.,
Gregory Bauer, individual and official capacity
Unknown Officers per Bivens vs. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics
1 Monroe Center St NW GRAND RAPIDS, MI 49503 616-456-3400

Defendant 4
KENT COUNTY, MICHIGAN
82 Ionia Avenue NW
, Suite 425 Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Defendant 5
KENT COUNTY SHERIFF
82 Ionia Avenue NW, Suite 425 Grand Rapids, MI 49503

Defendant 6
61st DISTRICT COURT, et al
Sarah Breen, individual and official capacity
Unknown Officers of the Court
180 Ottawa NW, Grand Rapids Michigan 49503-2751 616-632-6552/59503
FEDERAL QUESTION

FILED - GR
January 22, 2024 4:16 PM
CLERK OF COURT
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
BY:JMW SCANNED BY: JMW / 1-23

1:24-cv-57

Hala Y. Jarbou
Chief U.S. District Judge

1. Does the Fourth and Fifth Amendment to the United States Constitution for America prohibit Defendant, Gregory Bauer without probable cause from stopping, searching, seizing Petitioner/Suitor private automobile, and conducting a physical search of my body, and making an arrest solely on the grounds that Petitioner/Suitor private automobile lacks a license plate?
2. If I, Petitioner/Suitor chooses not to utilize highways, roadways, or streets for commercial purposes, opting not to engage in commerce (defined as fare, fee, rate, charge, or other consideration) directly or indirectly with any profit-oriented business or enterprise, does their private property (automobile) qualify as 'consumer household goods' exempt from congressional oversight and regulation? Moreover, if my private property remains outside of commercial use and not used for commercial purposes, can any violation of the Fifth Amendment's guarantee of due process be considered an infringement on the protection and security of Petitioner/Suitor private property?
3. In all the circumstances of this encounter, was Petitioner/Suitor right to personal security secured and protected by the Fourth Amendment be violated by an unreasonable search and seizure, and Fifth Amendment Due Process?
4. Does Defendant, Gregory Bauer' s failure to distinguish or differentiate between a stop and an arrest, and between a frisk and a search, violate Petitioner/Suitor Fifth Amendment protected right to due process?
5. Did Defendant, Gregory Bauer and unknown officers substantially intrude and interfere with liberty and personal security violating Petitioner/Suitor secured and protected Fourth Amendment right and interest to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures by forcibly removing Petitioner/Suitor from Private Property and compelling Petitioner/Suitor to the ground without Petitioner/Suitor voluntary consent as well violate Fifth Amendment Due Process Protection?
6. Did the seizure of Petitioner/Suitor private property, including my physical body and personal automobile, as evidence of a crime, without probable cause and a warrant, violate Petitioner/Suitor secured and protected Fourth Amendment rights against unreasonable searches and seizures, and Fifth Amendment Due Process?
7. Did the unfounded charges of a crime violate Petitioner/Suitor Fourth and Fifth Amendment protected and secured rights to be free from unreasonable interferences of privacy?
8. Was the Defendant, Gregory Bauer and unknown officer' s and Kent County Sheriff officer' s "search" and "seizure" constitutional by Fourth Amendment standards of probable cause to believe that (1) a crime had been committed or (2) a crime was in the process of being committed or (3) a crime was about to be committed?
9. Did the Defendant, Gregory Bauer on initial contact have constitutional grounds to insist on an encounter with Petitioner/Suitor, to make a forcible stop?
10. Is compelling Petitioner/Suitor to furnish fingerprints and a mugshot without being found guilty violate the protection of Fourth, Fifth and Ninth Amendment of the Constitution of for the United States?

11. Does compelling Petitioner/Suitor to furnish fingerprints and a mugshot without being charged with a crime constitute a search and seizure under the Fourth Amendment?
12. Does compelling Petitioner/Suitor to furnish fingerprints and a mugshot without being charged with a crime violate the Fifth Amendment protective right against self-incrimination? If so, is the Fifth Amendment protected right against self-incrimination applicable to non-testimonial evidence? Is the fact that the fingerprints and mugshots are being taken from people who have not been charged with a crime relevant to the Fifth Amendment analysis?
13. Does compelling Petitioner/Suitor to furnish fingerprints and a mugshot without being charged with a crime constitute a taking of private property without just compensation under the protection Fifth Amendment?
14. If compelling Petitioner/Suitor to furnish fingerprints and a mugshot without being charged with a crime does not constitute a search under the Fourth Amendment, and does the STATE OF MICHIGAN interest in obtaining fingerprints and mugshots outweigh the Petitioner/Suitor privacy rights and interest?
15. Is the Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination broad enough to protect Petitioner/Suitor from being forced to furnish fingerprints and a mugshot without being charged with a crime?
16. What are the risks of using fingerprints and mugshots to incriminate Petitioner/Suitor in crimes that they have not yet been charged with, in violation of the constitutional rights to privacy, due process, and equal protection under the law?
17. Is Defendant, Gregory Bauer' s act of running his hands around the top inner of pants and over the clothing and body of Petitioner/Suitor without undergoing the process of probable cause and obtaining a warrant from a sworn statement to attesting with first-hand knowledge that a crime has been or is being committed a lawful search under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution for the United States?

JUDICIAL NOTICE

Petitioner/Suitor respectfully moves and commands process that the Article III Judge of the Judicial branch to take judicial notice of my petition, which means that I am appearing in this legal matter without legal representation and lack formal legal training or a license to practice law. Considering this, the Judicial branch is constitutionally obligated to construe my pleadings liberally, consistent with established constitutional principles.

- The Due Process Clause of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States for America guarantees protection and secures the right to access the courts. This right includes the right to file a petition, claim and respectfully command process for relief without the assistance of an attorney.

- The Equal Protection Clause of the Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States for America guarantees, protects, and secures prohibits the government from discriminating against Petitioner/Suitor petition, claim and command process for relief. This means that Petitioner/Suitor must be given a fair opportunity to present my case, even by technical errors or lack legal training.

I. JUDICIAL COGNIZANCE

[See Exhibit 1 Affidavit of Notice
of Fiduciary + Trustee Appointment
[See Exhibit 5]

It is an established constitutional principle that Article III Judge of the judicial branch have a duty to uphold the highest standards of judicial performance, including the fair and impartial conduct of litigation. As articulated by Judge Aldrich in *in re Union Leader Corp.*, 292 F.2d 379, 384 (1st Cir. 1961), officials of the Judicial branch are bound by the "imperative of conducting legal proceedings with scrupulous fairness and unwavering impartiality." This fundamental tenet reflects not only a cornerstone of the legal profession, but also the very essence of justice itself. In *US v Lee* Court all the officers of the government from the highest to the lowest, are creatures of the law, and are bound to obey it. "In *Chandler v. Judicial Council*, Justice Douglas stated if judges break a law, they can be prosecuted ' Accordingly, Justice Black later stated "Judges, like other people, can be tried convicted and punished for crimes."

The right to safeguard justice before an unbiased Article III Judge of the judicial branch prohibits judges from participating in any proceeding in which their impartiality might reasonably be questioned. This principle is also grounded in the broader interest of justice and finds expression in judicial decisions such as *Pfizer Inc. v. Lord*, 456 F.2d 532 (2d Cir. 1972), where the court held that a judge's "failure to disclose a conflict of interest, even if unintentional, may be sufficient to create the appearance of bias and justify reversal."

In addition to the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America, the right to a fair and impartial judicial law process is also protected and secured by the Equal Protection Clause of the BILL OF RIGHTS.

The judicial branch' s commitment to fairness, impartiality, and the protection of natural and inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities is a linchpin of the justice system. It is a commitment enshrined in the safekeeping of justice, as well as firmly entrenched in judicial precedent. As such, it is incumbent upon the judiciary at all levels to uphold these principles to ensure the integrity of the justice system and the preservation of the Petitioner/Suitor fundamental natural and inherent rights, immunities, natural liberties, and interests.

II. TAKE JUDICIAL COGNIZANCE ATTORNEY UNSWORN STATEMENTS INADMISSIBLE [See Exhibit 4]

This NOTICE OF NON-ACCEPTANCE OF ATTORNEY TESTIMONY. Petitioner/Suitor moves, and respectfully command process that the Article III judge of the judicial branch to uphold the paramount principles of due process and fairness under the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution for America. Before any attorney makes any written, spoken or any form of statement, they must be sworn in under the penalty and pains of perjury, affirming that they possess firsthand knowledge and that their statements are true, correct, and not misleading. This fundamental safeguard ensures the reliability and credibility of attorney testimony, preventing the introduction of false or misleading information into the court record.

Furthermore, Petitioner/Suitor moves and respectfully command process that the Article III judge to bar all unsworn written and spoken statements from attorneys and adjudge as inadmissible. Unsworn statements lack the crucial element of accountability, rendering them susceptible to bias, speculation, and hearsay. Allowing unsworn statements would undermine the integrity of the judicial process and jeopardize the natural and inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor.

In accordance with the Sixth Amendment's guarantee of fair and impartial proceedings, Petitioner/Suitor respectfully command process that the Article III judge enforce the requirement of sworn testimony for all attorneys. This essential safeguard protects the integrity of justice and ensures that Petitioner/Suitor is treated with the utmost fairness.

- *"THE UNSWORN STATEMENTS, FACTUAL ASSERTIONS, AND ARGUMENTS OF COUNSEL ARE NOT EVIDENCE. Gentile Co., LLC v. The Bright Star Restaurant, Inc., (ms.2150901, October 14, 2016)_So.3d_(ala. Civ. App. 2016). 760. Perjury Cases — 28 U.S.C. 1746 — Unsworn Declarations Under Penalty Of Perjury.*
- *"An attorney for the plaintiff cannot admit evidence into the court. He is either an attorney or a witness" See (Trinsey v. Pagliaro D.C.Pa. 1964, 229 F. Supp. 647).*
- *Trinsey v Pagliaro, D.C.Pa. 1964, 229 F.Supp. 647. "Statements of counsel in brief or in argument are not facts before the court and are therefore insufficient for a motion to dismiss or for summary judgment." Pro Per and pro se litigants should therefore always remember that most of the time, the motion to dismiss a case is only argued by the opposing attorney, who is not allowed to testify on the facts of the case, the motion to dismiss is never argued by the real party in interest."*

III. VALID CLAIM FOR RELIEF

This petition asserts VALID Claims for commanded process for relief that is based on constitutional, equitable and common law principles. The DEFENDANTS' , acting individual capacity, and official capacity as agents of the STATE OF MICHIGAN, CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE DEPARTMENT, KENT COUNTY MICHIGAN, AND KENT COUNTY SHERIFF have by reason of their...

1. wrongful or wanton acts, and
2. conduct or bad purpose, and
3. evil or wrongful intent, and
4. lack of knowledge acts, and
5. unconstitutional activities, and
6. misfeasance, malfeasance, nonfeasance, and
7. willful or wanton conduct, and
8. willful or wanton misconduct, and
9. bad faith, malicious willful or wanton acts, and
10. willful of wanton duty of neglect, and
11. actual malice, and
12. willful, intentionally, or malicious acts, and
13. fraud whether criminal fraud, extrinsic, intrinsic, constructive, fraud in law, fraud in factum, fraud in inducement, hidden fraud, mail fraud, statute of fraud, actual fraud, tax fraud/civil fraud, and
14. gross negligence whether INTENTIONAL OR NON-INTENTIONAL
15. Egregious violation of Public Trust and Breach of Fiduciary Duty

Whether done intentionally or not intentionally, with or without legal justification or excuse, with or without knowledge, whether done under policies, practices, procedures, and/or customs, created, adopted, and enforced under COLOR OF STATE LAW DEFENDANTS in their individual capacity and official capacity did engage in actions that have transgressed constitutionally protected rights, immunities, liberties, and interests. These actions have been taken without proper basis and collectively and/or individually constitute a violation of the constitutional protected and secured natural and unalienable rights, natural justice, immunities, liberties, and interests of Petitioner/Suitor. *"Courts at the highest levels have consistently recognized the imperative of safeguarding the American people's constitutional rights, liberties, immunities and interests."* Specifically, the following cases have reiterated the paramount

importance of upholding constitutional rights and interests even in the face of government actions:

- Tennessee v. Garner, 471 U.S. 1 (1985)
- Graham v. Connor, 490 U.S. 386 (1989)
- Albright v. Oliver, 510 U.S. 266 (1994)
- Deitrich v. Burrows, 167 F.3d 1007, 1013 (6th Cir. 1999)
- Olson v. Tyler, 771 F.2d 277 (7th Cir. 1985)
- Knowles v. Iowa, 119 S.Ct. 484 (1998)
- Wyoming v. Houghton, 119 S.Ct. 1297 (1999)
- Kalina v. Fletcher, 118 S.Ct. 502 (1997)
- Hill v. McIntyre, 884 F.2d 271, 275 (6th Cir. 1989)
- Bruning v. Pixler, 949 F.2d 352, 357 (10th Cir. 1991)

The constitutional, equitable and common law foundation underpinning these VALID claims is firmly established in the Constitution of the United States for America and per federal law 93 Stat. 1284 and 108 Stat. 2071. Moreover, the duty to enforce the Constitution of the United States for America on behalf of the Petitioner/Suitor, the American beneficiary of the Republic, ensuring the protection of all natural and inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities guaranteed and secured protection to the Petitioner/Suitor by the Constitution of the United States for America. In United States v. Lee, 106 U.S. 196 (1882): *"The Supreme Court held that the federal courts have a duty to protect individuals from violations of their constitutional rights. This duty extends to state courts as well"*. In Downs v Bidwell, 182 Us 244 (1901) this could foretell the Framers greatest fears and details what inferior Article III courts have become without accountability. *"It will be an evil day for American Liberty if the theory of a government outside supreme law finds lodgment in our constitutional jurisprudence. No higher duty rests upon this Court than to exert its full authority to prevent all violations of the principles of the Constitution."*

IV. JURISDICTION

Petitioner/Suitor invokes jurisdiction under Article III standing of the United States Constitution for America, which vests the judicial power of the United States in the Constitutional Court. Petitioner/Suitor claims arise under the original Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States for America. Petitioner/Suitor seeks to vindicate natural, inherent, and unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities protected and secured by the Constitution of the United States for America.

These valid claims are also cognizable under Article III standing of Federal Law 62 Stat. 931 and 36 Stat. 1091, which grants federal courts jurisdiction over civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. The Constitution of the United States for America is the supreme law of the land, and Petitioner/Suitor claims arise under Constitutional, equity, common law principles under the Constitution of the United States for America. Therefore, the Constitutional Court has jurisdiction over this case.

In this matter, the controversy at hand exceeds the sum of \$75,000, thereby invoking federal jurisdiction. Furthermore, the nature of the redress involves the DEFENDANTS' FOREIGN CORPORATE CITIZENS OF A STATE, and a Private Indigenous American Sovereign acting as Petitioner/Suitor. This complex mix of parties and claims necessitates the expertise and jurisdictional reach of this Constitutional court. Crucially, addressed in Article 50 of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, as established by United Nation Resolution (2200A). This underscores the global significance of the rights enshrined within the Covenant, which are intended to apply universally, even within the confines of federal systems. Additionally, the Restatement (Third) of Foreign Relations Law of the United States, specifically at Restatement § 111, comment, clarifies that international law is also the law of every State highlighting the integration of international law principles into domestic legal systems. This principle is further affirmed by id. § 702, comment, which recognizes that the customary law of human rights, interest, liberties, and immunities is part of the law of America to be applied as such by State as well as federal courts.

In light of these justice foundations and precedents, it is evident that this Federal court's judicial jurisdiction is not only appropriate but also essential in ensuring the protection of natural inherent and unalienable rights, interests, liberties, immunities, and the fair resolution of this multi-faceted redress involving international equitable and common law principles.

Petitioner/Suitor invocation of constitutional, equity, and common law jurisdiction under Article III standing of the Union States Republic underscores the complexity and depth of the legal issues at hand. This multifaceted approach ensures that this redress is considered from various lawful perspectives, embracing the principles of justice, fairness, constitutional rights, and established legal doctrines.

- *"To disregard Constitutional law, and to violate the same, creates a sure liability upon the one involved: "State officers may be held personally liable for damages*

based upon actions taken in their official capacities." [Hafer v. Melo, 502 U.S. 21 (1991)].

- *"The party who brings a suit is master to decide what law he will rely upon and does determine whether he will bring a 'suit arising under' the Constitution or laws of the United States by his declaration or bill"* see Bell v. Hood, 327 U.S. 678 (1946).
- *"It authorizes any person, who is deprived of any right, privilege, or immunity secured to him by the Constitution of the United States, to bring an action against the wrong doer in the Federal courts and that without any limit whatsoever as to the amount in controversy. The deprivation may be of the slightest conceivable character,* See MONROE ET AL. v PAPE ET AL.

V. CLAIM of FUNDAMENTAL INHERENT RIGHTS, INTERESTS, NATURAL LIBERTIES, AND IMMUNITIES [See Exhibit 3]

This action is brought forth under the purview of Article III standing of Constitution of the United States for America, treaties, and United State laws per 93 Stat. 1284 and 108 Stat. 2071 bearing profound implications for the pursuit of justice and the safeguarding of constitutional rights, interest, liberties, and immunities. The claims against state and local governments are directly under the Constitution of the United States for America. Constitutional violations address intrusions and infringements of natural, inherent, and unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States for America and treaties. Under its aegis, Petitioner/Suitor is empowered to seek redress when constitutionally protected and secured natural, inherent, and unalienable rights, liberties, immunities, interests have been transgressed upon. Furthermore, when "injury in fact" has occurred upon the invasion of legally protected interests have been transgressed upon.

SUITS FOR PROSPECTIVE RELIEF directly under Constitution of the United States for America and treaties expressly establish a private cause of action under the Due process of the Bill of Rights and Fifth Amendment of Constitution for America. In these cases, the Constitution and treaties create a proper basis for seeking constitutional and equitable remedies aimed at preventing future harm or violations. A notable precedent in this regard is *The Cone Corporation v. Florida Department of Transportation*, 921 F.2d 1190, 1201 (11th Cir.), cert. denied 500 U.S. 942 (1991), in which the Eleventh Circuit held that the Cone Corporation had a private cause of

action to seek prospective relief under the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America to prevent the Florida Department of Transportation from taking its property without just compensation. One of the most important ways in which the Due Process Clause protects the Petitioner/Suitor rights is by ensuring that the government must provide meaningful remedies when natural, inherent unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities, and legal rights and interests are violated. The right to a remedy is essential to ensuring that the Due Process Clause is not merely a declaration of abstract rights, but rather a gross guarantee. The Supreme Court has confirmed the right to a remedy in numerous cases. In the case of *Monell v. Department of Soc. Svcs.*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978), the Court held that local governments can be sued under federal law for violations of the Due Process Clause. The Court reasoned that “*the right to a remedy is an integral part of the Due Process Clause*”. Another important example of the right to a remedy is the case of *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of the Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). In *Bivens*, the Court held that individuals could sue federal officials for violations of the Fourth Amendment. The Court reasoned that the right to a remedy is so fundamental that it can be implied from the Constitution of the United States for America. The right to a remedy is a vital safeguard of the American people rights, interests, liberties and immunities. It ensures that the government cannot violate the American people’s rights without fear of consequence. In essence, *Marbury v. Madison* affirmed “*that every injury inflicted upon an individual necessitates proper redress.*” Justice and fairness demand that when rights, interests, liberties and immunities are violated, the injured party must have access to the judicial law side of the court system to seek redress and rectify the harm suffered. This principle, deeply rooted in American jurisprudence, ensures that the American people are not left defenseless in the face of government OFFICIALS, OFFICERS and AGENTS actions that threaten rights, interests, life, liberty, private property and pursuit of happiness. Thus, the Due Process Clause serves as both a Constitutional guarantee and a call to action. It enshrines the concept of due process as a bulwark against arbitrary state actions, and the maxim it embodies reinforces the indivisible link between legal rights and the availability of equitable and legal remedies. Together, these principles underscore the enduring commitment of the justice system to safeguard Petitioner/Suitor fundamental inherent natural liberties, rights, interest and immunities are upheld by the rule of law. More importantly, the presumed availability of federal equitable relief against threatened invasions of Constitutional interests, liberties, immunities and rights appears entirely to negate the contention that the status of an interest as Constitutionally protected divests federal courts of the power to grant damages absent express congressional authorization. Congress provided specially for

the exercise of equitable remedial powers by federal courts, see Act of May 8, 1792, § 2, 1 Stat. 276; C. Wright, *Law of Federal Courts* 257 (2d ed., 1970), in part because of the limited availability of equitable remedies in state courts in the early days of the Republic. See *Guaranty Trust Co. v. York*, 326 U. S. 99, 326 U. S. 104-105 (1945). And this Judicial law side of the court's decisions make clear that, the absent congressional restrictions, the scope of equitable remedial discretion is to be determined according to the distinctive historical traditions of equity as an institution, *Holmberg v. Armbrrecht*, 327 U. S. 392, 327 U. S. 395-396 (1946); *Sprague v. Ticonic National Bank*, 307 U. S. 161, 307 U. S. 165-166 (1939). *The reach of a federal district court's "inherent equitable powers,"* *Textile Workers v. Lincoln Mills*, 353 U. S. 448, 353 U. S. 460 (Burton, J., concurring in result), is broad indeed, e.g., *Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education*, 401 U. S. 1 (1971).

Embedded within this Constitutional safeguard is a fundamental principle articulated through judicial precedent: "*Where there is a legal right, there is also a legal remedy.*" This celebrated maxim, often attributed to the landmark case of *Marbury v. Madison*, 5 U.S. 137, 163 (1803), is deemed the very essence of liberty within the legal system. It reflects a cornerstone principle that underpins the rule of law, the notion that substantive legal rights, once recognized, carry with them an implicit commitment to provide recourse and relief when those rights, interests, liberties, and immunities are infringed upon. To vindicate statutory private rights and invasion of a legally protected interest are brought on the basis for prospective relief is brought under 93 Stat. 1284, 108 Stat. 2071, that establishes a cause of action for infringement upon of rights and interests secured by the Constitution of the United States for America, and statutory private rights and invasion of a legally protected interest. The Supreme Court of the United States decision in *Rosado v. Wyman*, 397 U.S. 397 (1970) reinforced the significance of Section 1983 in safeguarding federal rights. These claims encompass a broad spectrum of constitutional and equitable rights and interests, and they empower Petitioner/Suitor to seek remedies when government OFFICIALS, OFFICERS and AGENTS actions and/or policies threaten fundamental inherent natural rights interest and immunities, constitutional infringements, invoking the principles of justice, fairness, constitutional integrity, invoking the principles of justice, fairness, and constitutional integrity.

VI. VENUE

Venue is proper under FEDERAL LAW 76 Stat. 744, section 1361 (e) the Defendants are...

- a. The DEFENDANTS are officers or employees of the United States or any agency thereof acting in his official capacity or under color of legal authority, or an agency of the United States, and
- b. The DEFENDANT' S have their primary corporate headquarters located within the UNITED STATES, MICHIGAN, WESTERN DISTRICT and/or residence within the United States, Michigan, western district. A substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims herein arose within the above-mentioned locations.

VII. AFFIDAVIT AND DISLOSURE STATEMENT OF STATUS & STANDING (See ~~6~~, 7)

Petitioner/Suitor moves and respectfully command process that the Article III tribunal take judicial notice of my specific objection to any erroneous and unproven presumption based on false conclusion of law administratively made regarding status before this Judicial law side of the court of abandonment or loss of status in the guaranteed Republic form of government. This Judicial law side of the court must take Judicial Notice that the Amarukan/American Aboriginal in private capacity acting as Petitioner/Suitor and Grantor that is the progeny prosperity of what my ancestors called Amaruka Amaru, "the land of the feathered plumed serpent" called in modern time Americas.

The Article III tribunal must take Judicial Notice that Petitioner/Suitor makes a contrary conclusion of law to the administrative presumption of a FRANCHISED CORPORATE STATUS subject under CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATIVE authority. The Private Indigenous American acting as Petitioner/Suitor is an un-enfranchised and fall not under territorial jurisdiction under a legislative body. *"Where it was concluded by that court (9th Circuit) that "the people" are not bound by codes, rules regulations and ordinances, being mere private acts of laws, but are inescapably and "forever" bound by the law of the land, being the general laws, and entitled to the free exercise of all processes provided by the general law of the land, which have been protected and secured by the several state constitutions as foundational, organic law and shall never be compromised".* Rodrigues v Secretary of Labor. Donovan. 769 F.2nd 1344 (1985).

Any statutory conversion, misclassification, and engaging the Indigenous Amarukan modern times called Indigenous American as a "SOVEREIGN CITIZEN" and "UNITED STATES CITIZEN" is disparity and deprivation of fundamental inherent unalienable Creator rights, liberties, immunities, and interests. Petitioner/Suitor always is to be identified in private status with an un-enfranchised status as an

artificial being, person, or natural person, ens legis, a federal or state created creature or entity, a heathen, an animal like creature or a creature of law an invisible, intangible, and existing only in contemplation of the law.

Petitioner/Suitor fundamental inherent and unalienable rights, liberties, immunities, and interests are to be always safeguarded. Any encroachment upon fundamental inherent and unalienable natural rights, liberties, immunities, and interests by legislative authority must be resolutely restrained. Any Article III judge safeguarding natural justice in legislative authority under Congressional authority of Article 1 will be concluded ultra vires acts and treason.

VIII. NOTICE TO SAFEGUARD NATURAL JUSTICE

Petitioner/Suitor specifically visits the law side of this Article III tribunal. Petitioner/Suitor respectfully command process for protection from corporate government encroachment into the private. I urge the Article III tribunal to uphold its Oath and duty to the Constitution of the United States for America, and to uphold and protect my secured private natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties. and immunities. Your oath of office compels this expectation and nothing less from you.

Petitioner/Suitor, invokes a fair warning due process claim, exhibiting a vigilant commitment to safeguarding justice and natural fundamental inherent rights, interest, liberties and immunities against potential infringements, deprivations, or violations, as well as any instances of gross negligence and malicious actions that might imperil the fundamental right to safeguard natural justice.

Petitioner/Suitor, fervently command process for the preservation of constitutionally protected and secured inherent natural unalienable rights, interests, immunities, and liberties enshrined within the Sixth Amendment of the CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES FOR AMERICA. Central among these rights is the sacrosanct guarantee of a fair safeguard of justice. Under the aegis of Constitutional law, as recognized and upheld within the framework of Article III standing of the Union States Republic, Petitioner/Suitor reaffirm that the Article III tribunal is to defend natural fundamental inherent unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities that is secured and protected by the Constitution of the United States for America.

Petitioner/Suitor expectations are clear and resonate with the tenets of judicial duty. Petitioner/Suitor firmly believes that the Article III tribunal presiding over this matter will provide an impartial forum, thereby fulfilling the core obligations of their judicial office. This commitment to impartiality is intrinsic to the administration and safeguarding of justice, ensuring that Petitioner/Suitor is afforded a fair and unbiased proceeding.

IX. BACKGROUND AFFIDAVIT OF STATEMENTS OF FACTS GROUNDS FOR
CLAIM (See Exhibit 8, 9, 10, 11, 12)

Verification statement of evidence

I, Carolyn-jean having attained the age of the majority, and not a minor nor incompetent person as defined in statute, do hereby proclaim as well as attest and affirm that the aforementioned is wholly accurate, is based on actual firsthand knowledge and actual firsthand facts and conclusions of law and presented on this day _____, under penalty of divine retribution if otherwise so help me Most High who has witness this event in my Private Capacity.

1. I, Carolyn-jean, traveling on Giddings St had signaled right to turn onto Bemis St, and that.
2. Upon turning unto Bemis St, a CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE cruiser was approaching straight unto Bemis St, and that.
3. I, Carolyn-jean was pursuing my journey to my destination, so I made a right unto Bemis St a CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE cruiser, and that.
4. I, Carolyn-jean noticed the CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE cruiser driving in proximity of my private automobile, and that.
5. I, Carolyn-jean noticed emergency lights on I pull over to let officer go around officer pulled behind me.
6. The driver of the CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE CRUISOR was not driving in a comfortable space of one car length away.
7. I, Carolyn-jean, sat in my private automobile.
8. I, Carolyn-jean, was under the impression an emergency had occurred, so I pulled to the side slowing awaiting the POLICE CRUISOR to go around my private automobile, but the driver of the POLICE CRUISOR remained driving behind my private automobile, and that.
9. I, Carolyn-jean pulled in front of a physical home with the address of, and that.

- 10.I, Carolyn-jean, became aware of the driver exiting out of the POLICE CRUISOR and turning on a bright light and approach my private automobile from behind, and that.
- 11.I, Carolyn-jean, with my own eyes saw the DRIVER with the bright light which appeared to be a flashlight shined it onto the left side of the back window of my private automobile, and that.
- 12.I, Carolyn-jean with my own eyes saw the DRIVER become aware of the NOTICE that state' s "This Automobile is PRIVATE PROPERTY For "household goods" And consumer goods" NOT FOR COMMERCIAL USE NOT FOR PROFIT, NOT FOR GAIN and NOTICE: Further, the courts have found that the Corporate Public Servants who IGNORE their accountability as mandated in the law and the Bill of Rights have by their silence and failure to fully inform the sovereign people of the consequences arising from the corporate "offer to contract" is DEEMED SILENT DECEPTION AND INDUCEMENT BY FRAUD, (See EXHIBIT), and that
- 13.I, Carolyn-jean, heard a knock at the left front door window where I was sitting at, and that.
14. I, Carolyn-jean, heard the driver of the POLICE CRUISOR say, "roll down your window", and that.
- 15.I, Carolyn-jean, rolled down the window for discovery and/or inquiry of the stop, and that.
- 16.The OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE, from what I heard stated, "get out the car didn' t ask for driver' s license or registration", and that.
- 17.I, Carolyn-jean, politely and calmly communicated I didn' t do anything I was on the phone calling my daughter ask why you so cruel officer said very impulse get off the phone get out the car do not bring harm to me because I want to know what I did wrong officer, and that.
- 18.I, Carolyn-jean, an officer snatched my phone from me slammed on the top of my private automobile, and that.
- 19.The OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE, and yell get out are I will pull you out, "never ask for driver' s license or registration", and that.
- 20.I, Carolyn-jean, politely and calmly communicated I have not done anything, why are you so mad, and that.
21. I, Carolyn-jean, ask am i being DETAINED, Carolyn-jean ask why I didn' t do anything. The officer hadn' t run my name and that.
- 22.The OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE stated, "I pulled you over for not having plates on the vehicle for this traffic stop", and that.
- 23.The CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE proceeded to stop Carolyn-jean. under color of law for an alleged violation of MICHIGAN STATE VEHICLE TRAFFIC LAW, and that
- 24.I, Carolyn-jean, politely and calmly communicated I have more questions and would you provide me your name and badge number and asked is this encounter being recorded, and that
- 25.The PEACE OR POLICE OFICE stated, "I am Officer Bauer". While I am communicating the OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE is not allowing me to speak so he rudely talks over me, with madness saying yes, my cam is on and so is my dash cam and that

26. Gregory Bauer did not clearly inform Carolyn-jean that she had a right to remain silent, and that anything she says will be used against her in court, to assure a continuous opportunity to exercise it, and to honor them fully, and that.
27. As I was pulled out my private automobile thrown down to the ground by Gregory Bauer DETAINMENT, I was knee in the back with officer Bauer weight on me, "by way of kidnapping", and that.
28. I, Carolyn-jean, fear for my life, by this time there were white female armed OFFICER, whether PEACE OR POLICE standing by my private automobile with no witnesses around but an impartial unit of OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE, and that
29. I, Carolyn-jean in an arear with no witnesses, un-armed, and afraid by white officer's female and men. I, Carolyn-jean feared they had the power to bring great bodily harm to me no less than murder if I was to get out my familiar environment, and that.
30. Gregory Bauer tone was forcefully un-comfortable and intimidating, and that.
31. Gregory aggressively opened Carolyn-jean's private automobile door and the door swung far opened, and Gregory Bauer reached into the private automobile, wrapped both his hands around my left wrist and employed unreasonable force unto my physical body, and that.
32. I, Carolyn-jean's brain, believed that I was in great danger and feared I was about to die, and I felt my body naturally go into shock, and that.
33. Gregory-Bauer with unreasonable force yanked my left arm so hard that it compelled my entire body to uncontrollably fall out the private automobile unto the ground, and while on the ground female OFFICER just standing by whether PEACE OR POLICE on top of me pinned my face down on the ground applying an immense amount of pressure unto her cervical and lumbar vertebra creating a pop in her lumber spine that caused great pain that inflicted tension that caused my spinal injury to worsen while handcuffing me making me involuntarily compliant (See EXHIBIT ER of spinal sprain), and that.
34. Gregory Bauer did use more force than reasonably necessary to not to prevent me from being injured, and that.
35. I Carolyn-jean, communicated to unknown officer at that time I felt ok whether PEACE OR POLICE, I said to myself no one should have to be treated in this manner and that.
36. Gregory Bauer whether PEACE OR POLICE forcefully lifted me off the ground and Gregory Bauer stated, "you are going to jail, without even knowing who I am and that
37. Gregory Bauer pulled my left arm involuntarily directing my entire physical body to walk to a POLICE CRUISOR, whether PEACE OR POLICE and that
38. I, Carolyn-jean locomotion was physically restrained by handcuffs and as I was standing in the front of a police cruiser. With no NOTICE of what was to occur, I felt hands touch my body and I was unable to protect myself from Gregory Bauer hands as he explored my physical body, and

39. I, Carolyn-jean communicated to Gregory Bauer that he does not have my consent to touch my private property my body and told him to stop touching my body, there is a female officer by just watching but Gregory Bauer forced himself upon me with his hands and continued punitively raping, punishing my physical body, and that
40. Gregory Bauer began with my legs "by patting them down with both hands on one leg and then coming up and . . . putting his hands on the inner thigh up towards the groin area, and then coming down the other side. . . . then came up and . . . ran the side of his hand, with the little finger entering into my pants pockets (the left then the right that were made deep which allowed his touching my external genital ...then moving his hands over my breast perpendicularly down the middle . . . then around my waistline in my pants I said are you going in my pants and proceeding from the back of my neck around my entire back, and that
41. While being continually sexually intimidated, I communicated to Gregory Bauer again there is a female officer and his constituents he communicated, "yea I am doing it", and that
42. I, Carolyn-jean, communicated to Gregory Bauer that he cannot touch my private property my body and told him to stop touching my body, but Gregory Bauer forced himself upon me with his hands and continued punitively raping, punishing my physical body taking captive in a police cruiser, my automobile would be towed I said why my house is right there and that
43. I, Carolyn-jean, felt sexually intimidated, and that
44. After Gregory Bauer conducted an unreasonable without probable cause physical body search, I Carolyn-jean was involuntarily force and without my consent to be position inside a POLICE CRUISOR, and that
45. I asked Gregory Bauer why I was going to jail. and that
46. Gregory Bauer opened the POLICE CRUISOR and forcefully shoved my physical body in the POLICE CRUISOR HAVING held my physical body captive, and that
47. As I Carolyn-jean, physical body was held captive in the POLICE CRUISOR, I was chanting being grateful for the experience and while I was chanting and praying, I noticed Gregory Bauer and unknown female OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE inside my private automobile and performing an entire warrantless search, and that
48. Gregory Bauer walked to the POLICE CRUISOR with my passport single key in his hand, which I did not know I had my passport I usually keep in my jacket pocket and that
49. Unknown female officer kidnapped me and took me to another POLICE CRUISOR set in the back, seat another unknown POLICE asked if I needed medical attention, I said I am ok right now, and that
50. Gregory Bauer had in his possession my passport, which indicated he searched my purse without my consent. I am charging him with unlawfully searching my private property and taking my property, and that
51. During the search of the 2006 Dodge Ram, Gregory Bauer and unknown Officer commenced with a process to unlawfully seize the private property by verbal and/or written communication to attend at the scene to administer an unlawful taking of private property under color of law, and

52. Gregory Bauer asked I, Carolyn-jean, if I had a license before, and I did not communicate, and that
53. I ask unknown female officer where my key was, officer said Bauer has it and that
54. Gregory Bauer and unknown officers overed looked my posted private property signs in my front window on the dash and my \$20,000.00 dollar for sale sign, officer Bauer then said my private automobile, would be towed and that
55. I, Carolyn-jean has full authorization of custody, care possession and rights and interests of the 2006 Dodge Ram/
56. As I sat captive in the POLICE CRUISOR uncomfortably waiting for OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE to bring over the complaint to unknown officer, and that
57. The OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE identified himself as the unknown. Unknown Sergeant communicated, "he was called to the scene and communicated if you would have done what you were told this would not be, and that I need to take responsibility for my actions, and I communicated, "I didn' t do anything wrong, and that
58. The OFFICER whether PEACE OR POLICE unknown Sergeant doesn' t take responsibility for his officer' s bad behavior, and that
59. I, Carolyn-jean was kidnapped and held captive in a POLICE CRUISOR, being taken to an unknown location, and that
60. Andrew Middleton pulled into a private drive that was scan access only and drove into a private lot and parked the cruiser, and that
61. Gregory Bauer exited the POLICE CRUISOR and walked over to unknown officer and said you are good to go, and that
62. I communicated to unknown officer why is that when another officer gets behind me they keep going, and that
63. I, Carolyn-jean communicated to unknown officer what did I do, and that
64. Unknown officer grabbed my arm and pulled my physical body to access only door and walked me into a room left of the access door with others in the room, and that
65. Unknown officer directed walked me to the end of the room and started questing researching again, why I don' t know I just got out of a police cruiser, and that
66. Unknown officer asked questions from another office that was in the room, I communicated why the hand cuffs are still on, that other person in here doesn' t have any on, said I was fighting the officer, and that
67. I, Carolyn-jean communicated to Unknown officer, take the handcuffs off me, and she stated, "No and to sit down", and that
68. I, Carolyn-jean, communicated the cuffs are hurting, unknown officer stated they will come off in the next room and that

69. Unknown officer filled out the paper that I did not have access to review, so I have no knowledge or conscious awareness of what Andrew Middleton put onto the paper, and that
70. Unknown officer escorted me out the room by pulling me to another entrance where there were two female deputy's that grabbed onto my personal property my body (one standing to the right of me holding the other to the left searching me again why I am inside the prison, and that
71. I, Carolyn-jean communicated to each deputy that I have been searched already they said we know we still have to do a search before you enter in. one of the male deputies communicated that I have to place my thumb into a machine to run identification, and that
72. I Carolyn-jean had to stand in front of device to have photo taken, and that
73. I Carolyn-jean did not give consent to, and that
74. I Carolyn-jean sat in a area with others, as I was setting I notice blood running down my leg so I ask for a bandage this injure was cause by officer Gregory Bauer throwing me to the ground, and that
75. I, Carolyn-jean, communicated that I do not consent to running a thumb print and the male deputy said what did you say pulled me to come closer to the machine grabbing my hand to involuntarily position my thumb on the machine, and that
76. A lady deputy took my property, the draw string of my pants, my pants wouldn't stay up and that
77. The woman deputy searched thru my private property of my hair and removed my scarf and my wig, embarrassing me completely while the female officer, took all my pennies out of my hair I felt completely mentally raped and humiliated, and that
78. While I, Carolyn-jean communicated to the female deputy that I would like to know my bond, and that
79. I, Carolyn-jean within those long hours waiting that I didn't have a bond I would have to call a bondman, and that
80. The male deputy provided I, Carolyn-jean a card with numerical numbers to utilize the phone, and that
81. After that process I called and updated my husband, and that
82. Within an hour of that process, a nurse called me into an office requesting my name and to take vitals and answer questions. I communicated to the nurse I do not consent to providing information nor participate in the questionnaire. The nurse typed information within the system that I did not have permission to read, so I have no knowledge or conscious awareness of what the nurse typed, and that
83. After exiting the nurse, I was sent back into the holding room until they finally said you have a bond, I would have to pay 10,000 dollars I said what that is high and that
84. My daughter was there to tender the \$2000.00 and they told her CAROLYN JEAN BURNETT needed a bondman it took till around 12:40 pm for her to tender the payment and it took until on,, around or after 1:00pm to be called to be set at my liberty, and that

85. I opened the personal bag and discovered an Incident report that was unreadable at the bottom of the report and that stated directions of what to do are on the back and all documents were blank and it did not list a physical address (see Exhibit), and that
86. I, Carolyn-jean invoked my right to remain silent and did not voluntarily, knowingly or intelligently waive them during the course of the entire action, and that
87. I, Carolyn-jean exercised my rights and refrained from answering any inquires or providing any documents that would self-incriminate and or assist in providing evidence during the entire course of this action, and that
88. The search was "without cause, consent or warrant," and that the arrest was "without cause, reason or warrant.
89. I, Carolyn-jean falsely, unlawfully without probable cause and wrongfully with force and without my consent and against my will was arrested and imprisoned and deprived of my liberty for approximately 6 hours.
90. I, Carolyn-jean, tendered \$168.50 to the CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE IMPOUND to obtain my private automobile, and had to tender \$50.00 to get it towed off the lot because of not having any STATE plates, and that
91. I, Carolyn-jean tendered \$5.00 to obtain a copy of a police report that was altered with black lines preventing full disclosure of what was said, and that
92. I, Carolyn-jean, by UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE REGISTERED MAIL NUMBER RF165342231US mailed PHYSICAL DRIVERS LICENSE with number B653108744167 along with forms and AFFIDAFIT AND NOTICE OF DRIVERS LICENSE CANCELLATION, canceling DRIVERES LICENSE CONTRACT to STATE OF MICHIGAN LICENSING DEPARTMENT, and was told by a STATE OF MICHIGAN REPRESENTATIVE IN FEBUARY 2021 that the DRIVERS LICENSE was canceled, and that
93. Said actions of DEFENDANTS constituted an unlawful ad unwarranted invasion of my privacy and incited gross humiliation and emotion and physical stress bodily harm upon I, Carolyn-jean. I, Carolyn-jean reputation has been greatly injured and has been brought in public disgrace, and have been greatly hindered and prevented from transacting my affairs and has suffered great emotional trauma and harm all to DEFENDANTS' damages.
94. The Charges stated by DEFENDANTS were made with malice or knowingly reckless and casted I, Carolyn-jean in false light defaming my character.
95. I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with factual evidence of being a resident of the STATE OF MICHIGAN, being a PERSON/NATURAL PERSON/ARTIFICAL ENTITY/ENS LEGIS/FEDERAL OR STATE CREATED CREATURE, being a TAXPAYER, being a REGISTERED VOTER, being a DRIVER/OPERATOR OF A MOTOR VEHICLE, or being a UNITED STATES CITIZEN.
96. I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with factual evidence of violating any crime.

- 97.I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with factual evidence that the injuries in fact were not caused by alleged violations of statutes, codes, rules and/or ordinances.
- 98.I, Carolyn-jean, have not been presented with factual evidence of any admittance to violating any statutes, codes, rules and/or ordinances, and at no time any evidence that I committed a crime was presented or issued.
- 99.I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with factual evidence of assaulting or battery of a police officer, resist arrest, willfully, unlawfully, or knowingly committed a crime in front of a POLICE OFFICER OR PEACE OFFICER.
100. I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with factual evidence of DEFENDANT' S DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.
101. I, Carolyn-jean did address the 61st DISTRICT COURT on or around Dec. 05, 2023, and spoke with an employee to acquire all the case numbers attached with the CAROLYN JEAN BURNETT, matter, employee stated it was a lot and I could go online and get it for free, and that
102. The employee of the 61st district court provided, I, Carolyn-jean the following info to go online, because it was a lot, \$10.00 for the first copy and anything after that would be 2.00 a copy, and that
103. The employee presented no case number, and that
104. On Dec 2023, I, Carolyn-jean visited the 61st District Court to file into the record NOTICE OF SPECIAL APPEARANCE and NOTICE OF REMOVAL, and that
105. I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with factual evidence of PERSON CAROLYN JEAN BURNETT being an runaway Debtor, and that
106. I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with actual evidence of Officers, DEPUTIES, and Officials of STATE OF MICHIGAN, CITY OF KENTWOOD, CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, KENTWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT GRAND RAPIDS POLICE DEPARTMENT, KENT COUNTY, MICHIGAN, KENT COUNTY SHERIFF affidavit or sworn statement that shows probable cause for warrantless arrest.
107. I, Carolyn-jean have not been presented with actual evidence of Officers, DEPUTIES, and Officials of STATE OF MICHIGAN, CITY OF KENTWOOD, CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, KENTWOOD POLICE DEPARTMENT GRAND RAPIDS POLICE DEPARTMENT, KENT COUNTY, MICHIGAN, KENT COUNTY SHERIFF bonds for faithful discharge of their official duties.

X. GROUNDS FOR THE CLAIM

- *"A cause of action does not consist of facts, but of the unlawful violation of a right which the facts show. In United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715 (1966).*
- *In the sense of judicial power, exists whenever there is a claim "arising under [t]he Constitution, the Laws of the United States, and Treaties made, or which shall be made, under their Authority," U.S. Const., Art. III, § 2. United Mine Workers of America v. Gibbs, 383 U.S. 715 (1966).*

The grounds for this claim include but are not limited to the alleged violations to wit.

1. At all relevant times set forth herein, Andrew Middleton, Benjamin Howie, Ryan Manser, Justin Scavarda, and unknown officers was a police officer, law enforcement officer and/or peace officer employed by STATE OF MICHIGAN BY AND THRU ITS SUBSIDIARIES CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS OR KENT COUNTY MICHIGAN. At all times mentioned in this complaint all DEFENDANTS was acting UNDER COLOR OF LAW and COLOR OF HIS/HER AUTHORITY as such police officer, law enforcement officer and/or peace officer employed by STATE OF MICHIGAN BY AND THRU ITS SUBSIDIARIES CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS OR KENT COUNTY MICHIGAN. All DEFENDANTS are sued individually and in their official capacity.

COUNT CHARGE 1 (FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF)

COLOR OF LAW, OFFICE AND AUTHORITY and CONSPIRACY AGAINST RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW, OFFICE AND AUTHORITY. CONSTITUTIONAL INVASION.

MUNICIPAL LIABILITY LAW AND PRACTICE, THIRD EDITION VOLUME 1 PAGE 8-6, states, "Police officers is a potent symbol of the badge of state authority, courts have held that an officer is acting under the color of state law, even I the officer is violating official municipal policy. It has been held that acts taken by police officers while on patrol or pursuant to official duties are acts done under the color of state law" .

DEFENDANTS' "all" mean ANDREW MIDDLETON, BENJAMIN HOWIE, JUSTIN SCAVARDA, RYAN MANSER, William Recor AND UNKNOWN GRAND RAPIDS OFFICER' S AND KENT COUNTY SHERIFF UNKNOWN OFFICER' S. DEFENDANTS' mean ANDREW MIDDLETON, BENJAMIN HOWIE, JUSTIN SCAVARDA, RYAN MANSER, William Recor AND UNKNOWN GRAND RAPIDS OFFICER' S. DEFENDANTS "all" are STATE actors.

Unknown officers' , *"When a plaintiff cannot specifically state which defendant (police officers) used force on plaintiff but can specify that certain defendants were among the police officers who were surrounding plaintiff when plaintiff was beaten, and the officers agree they are among the officers who were present, the jury can reasonably infer that the named officers were participants in the alleged unlawful conduct"* , see *Rutherford v. City of Berkeley*, 780 F.2d 1444, 1448 (9th Cir.1986).

Said actions by DEFENDANT' S, Andrew Middleton and UNKNOWN GRAND RAPIDS AND KENT COUNTY SHERIFF whether in the capacity as LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER' S, PEACE OFFICER or POLICE OFFICER who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' individual conduct was the proximate cause of deprivations of the Petitioner/Suitor constitutional protected and secured rights, interests, and immunities. DEFENDANTS' individual actions are the direct cause of the harm that befell the Petitioner/Suitor. DEFENDANT' S willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor pursuant to Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, 93 Statute 1284 under color of law to be free from ...

1. To be free from illegal unlawful seizure of her body, free-will, private personal security, and
2. To be free from unwarranted invasion of privacy, and
3. To be free from unwarranted interrogation, and
4. To be free from illegal commitment, detention, and imprisonment, and
5. To be free from legislative authority of policies, codes, rules and ordinances, and
6. To be free from be held in slavery, involuntarily servitude, compulsory service by intimidation, and
7. To be free from suffer of prosecution and incarceration, and
8. To be free from arrest with the intent of producing on the mind to be a servant to be an employee, and
9. To be free from force, fraud and intimidation, threats of prosecution, bodily harm, and
10. To be free from being falsely accused of a crime and be carried to in front of a magistrate in order to be convicted and put to hard labor, and
11. be free from human trafficking as defined as sex trafficking in commercial sex act induced by force, fraud and/or coercion, and the recruitment of harboring, transporting and/or obtaining of a man or woman for the subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage and/or slavery. See Exhibit A Circular 3591
12. To have complete right of immunity and to be left alone. As well said by Judge Cooley: *"The right to one's person may be said to be a right of complete immunity; to be left alone."* Cooley on Torts 29.

All fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the

DEFENDANTS knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did...

13. DEFENDANTS did restrain Petitioner/Suitor of property right of my free-will to involuntary submission to the custody and verbal communication with DEFENDANTS' , and
14. DEFENDANTS did falsely make an arrest on November 26, 2023, without undergoing procedural process to obtain probable cause, and
15. DEFENDANTS did falsely search and seizure Petitioner/Suitor physical body, and
16. DEFENDANTS did falsely search and seizure the private automobile, 2006 Dodge Ram and the secured property within the automobile, and
17. DEFENDANTS did perform a warrantless arrest, search, and seizure, and
18. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did not provide Petitioner/Suitor with a signed affidavit under the penalty and pains of perjury specifically stating the exact criminal crime that was being investigated that clearly established probable cause for search, seizure, arrest, detention, commitment, imprisonment, and invasion of privacy, and
19. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did negligently interpret the law of crimes, arrest, search, seizure, detention, commitment, and imprisonment, and
20. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did unlawfully use applications of physical force, and
21. DEFENDANTS' , did act in a willful disregard or the safety of the Petitioner/Suitor, and against Petitioner/Suitor private personal property i.e. physical body and free-will that caused disfigurement, bodily harm, serious bodily harm, grievous bodily harm, unlawful wounding, wounding with intent, malicious wounding, and did intentionally impede on the Petitioner/Suitor normal breathing or circulation of the blood by applying pressure on the back of neck and
22. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did unlawfully use applications of physical force against Petitioner/Suitor private personal property i.e. physical body and free-will with the intent to wound, with the intent to suffocate, with the intent assault to do great bodily harm less than the crime of murder, and
23. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did unlawful use applications of physical force unto DEFENDANT' S private personal property, that did leave marks but did emotional scar causing injury by the act, and
24. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did actively conspire with intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of protected and secured rights under color of law, office and authority, and
25. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did seize and search Petitioner/Suitor private property i.e. my purse and took my passport from a secured compartment

- without a warrant, without consent and authorization and without a warrant, and
26. DEFENDANTS did seize and search my private property i.e. my private automobile without a warrant, without my consent and without probable cause, and
 27. DEFENDANTS did conspire with unknown tow company to seize and steal my private automobile for ransom, and
 28. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did engage in a conspiracy with the intent to human traffic under peonage, (debt slavery or debt servitude) and
 29. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did not provide Petitioner/Suitor with a signed affidavit signed under the penalty and pain of perjury stating an informant' s statement establishing that Petitioner/Suitor committed a crime nor provided a complaint of an injured party having claims against Petitioner/Suitor establishing personal harm by Petitioner/Suitor, and
 30. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did conspire with the intent to order Petitioner/Suitor unlawfully and involuntarily to involuntarily submit herself to the police agency that arrested to be committed to the custody of the Sheriff for seizure of Petitioner/Suitor private property of genetic material, DNA material, my likeness for biometric data through fingerprints, photograph, and other unknown material without consent and authorization to use private property for public benefit, and
 31. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did provide misleading and false averments and did file false and erroneous statements, and
 32. DEFENDANT, GEGORY BAUER did without consent or authorization of the Petitioner/Suitor used the law enforcement information network to determine whether the arrested is a parolee under the jurisdiction of the department of corrections, and
 33. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did abuse power and did misuse power, and actions did deprive the health, safety, welfare, or property of Petitioner/Suitor from actual or threatened harm, and
 34. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did misuse of power possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the DEFENDANTS' , "all" were clothed with the authority of state law, an action taken under color of law.
 35. DEFENDANTS did breach the peace, did breach the public health, public safety, and breached public trust, and
 36. DEFENDANTS' , "all" did commit Petitioner/Suitor to handcuffs, to arrest, to imprisonment, to detention, to prosecution, to involuntary servitude under peonage (debt slavery, debt servitude) for improper charges that were not criminal injuries in nature.
 37. DEFENDANTS did imminently danger the health and safety of the public.

Said actions by DEFENDANT' S separately and concert did violate the first, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, ninth, tenth and eleventh amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America and the Bill of Rights.

- Rev. Stat. § 1979, 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides: *Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory or the District of Columbia, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress, except that in any action brought against a judicial officer for an act or omission taken in such officer's judicial capacity, injunctive relief shall not be granted unless a declaratory decree was violated or declaratory relief was unavailable. For the purposes of this section, any Act of Congress applicable exclusively to the District of Columbia shall be considered to be a statute of the District of Columbia...And if bodily injury results from the acts committed in violation of this section or if such acts include the use, attempted use, or threatened use of a dangerous weapon, explosives, or fire, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.*
- *"Misuse of power possessed by virtue of state law and made IT possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of state law is action taken "under color of" state law within the meaning of § 1979. United States v. Classic, 313 U.S. 299; Screws v. United States, 325 U.S. 91. Pp. 183-187.*
- 18 U.S.C. § 242 makes certain conduct by persons acting "under color of law" that violates Citizens' constitutional rights a federal criminal offense.
- Color of law. The appearance or semblance, without the substance, of a legal right. The term usually implies a misuse of power made possible because the wrongdoer is clothed with the authority of the state. State action is synonymous with color of state law in the context of federal civil-rights statutes or criminal law. See state Action. Cases: Civil Rights 1323. C.J.S Civil Rights 92-94.
- Color of law. The term does not mean actual law, but means mere semblance of a legal right. (Kinney Law Dictionary). See State ex rel. West v. Des Moines, 96 Iowa, 521, 31 L.R.A. 186, 192, 65 N.W. Rep. 818.
- Amendment X. The enumeration in the Constitution of certain rights shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.
- Mendoza v City of Rome, 8872 F. Supp. 1110 (N.D.N.Y. 1994) *"Where probable cause is absent, an arrest at the direction of another officer is actionable. The arresting officer was liable. There was no discussion of qualified immunity.*

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, and suffer from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation,

embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANT' S.

COUNT CHARGE 2 (SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF)

DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS, TRESPASS, ENCROACHMENT AND INVASION OF INHERENT FUNDAMENTAL ALIENABLE RIGHTS, INTERESTS, AND IMMUNITIES UNDER COLOR OF LAW, CONSTITUTIONAL INVASION.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to punish Petitioner/Suitor for having exercised constitutional protected and secured rights, interest and immunities to confront Petitioner/Suitor to...

- a. To travel freely within the United States, guaranteed and protected by the Bill of Rights and First, fourth, fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for America.
- b. To be free from impediment upon my locomotion, body security and free-will, guaranteed and protected by the Bill of Rights and First, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, ninth, tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for America.
- c. To be free from unlawful interrogation, guaranteed and protected by the Bill of Rights and First, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, ninth, tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for America
- d. To be free from congressional legislation oversight and/or legislative enactment from false, illegal, and forced arrest, imprisonment,

detention, commitment, incarceration without sworn and affirmed evidence of a criminal injury, guaranteed, and protected by the Bill of Rights and First, fourth, fifth, sixth, eighth, ninth, tenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for America.

This right to travel encompasses the use of public highways, streets, and roadways for private purposes, including the pursuit of life and liberty. No law, regulation, or rule can infringe upon this fundamental right. The first Amendment to the Constitution of the United States for America made it clear that Congress cannot infringe upon the Bill of Rights contract in full form (First ten amendments). The right to use the public highways, (streets were made for the people) streets and roadways for private, rather than for commercial purposes, interstate commerce or intrastate commerce is a fundamental unalienable natural right and interest. The right to travel the roadways, streets, and highways in pursuit of life and free-will, and not for hire, corporate gain, or trafficking goods or commodities for sale is a fundamental unalienable natural right and interest. Petitioner/Suitor use of private automobile for personal property household consumer good, and not for the operation of any commerce monetary gain whether interstate or intrastate is fundamental unalienable natural right and interest. In *Hale v. Henkel*, 201 U.S. 43 (1906) Pp. 3, 5, 9 “We are of the opinion that there’ s a clear distinction. . . . *between an individual and a corporation... The individual may stand upon his constitutional rights as a Citizen. He is entitled to carry on his private business in his own way. His power to contract is unlimited. He owes no duty to the State... He owes no such duty to the State since he receives nothing therefrom beyond the protection of his life and property. His rights are such as existed by the law of the land long antecedent to the organization of the State and can only be taken from him by due process of law, and in accordance with the Constitution.*” In *United States v. Classic*, 313 U.S. 299 (1941), “*making it a crime to conspire to “injure” or “oppress” any Citizen “in the free exercise of any right secured to him by the Constitution.*” In *Ex parte Dickey* (*Dickey v. Davis*) 76 W.Va. 576, L.R.A. 1915 F, 840, P.U.R. 1915 E, 93, 85 S.E. 781, we find this apt expression of the court, “*The right of a Citizen to travel upon the highway and transport his property thereon, in the ordinary course of life and business, differs radically and obviously from that of one who makes the highway his place of business and uses it for private gain, in the running of a stagecoach or omnibus.*”

On November 26, 2023, by using a mechanical device such as a red and blue light indicating an emergency to direct Petitioner/Suitor, to pull to the side of the street or roadway to stop, DEFENDANTS’ willfully and knowingly trespassed upon and invaded Petitioner/Suitor natural, inherent, and unalienable rights, interests, and immunities. I, Petitioner/Suitor under duress and in fear for my safety and life involuntarily stopped my private automobile. DEFENDANTS approached the private automobile and performed an investigation by ordering Petitioner/Suitor to self-

incrimination in producing driver's license/operator's license for the sole purpose of obtaining discovery. *"When policeman stops a traveler, he is trespassing creating a private nuisance and if the policeman issues a traffic infraction, he creates an aggravation of circumstance. Although, the infraction is tantamount to a solicitation, and thusly, an invitation to engage in a secured transaction (saving elaboration), see UCC let seq, offering an opportunity to the traveler, to submit to state jurisdiction, and/or admit that someone was actually driving a business", In AGO 1959 No. 88 - Dec 10, 1959, Attorney General John J. O'Connell. "Power to investigate, however, does not give a police officer license to violate the individual's constitutional right not to be searched except on probable cause. In other words, although "suspicion" may well be sufficient basis for a policeman to stop and question an individual, it furnishes no ground for an examination of his person since, as Justice DOUGLAS reminds us, "There is no crime known as 'suspicion'" and the Fourth Amendment allows searches "only for 'probable cause". Douglas, Vagrancy and Arrest on Suspicion", 70 Yale L. J. 1, 12, 13.*

Petitioner/Suitor suffered deprivation of rights secured by the Constitution of the United States for America, particularly the right not to be classified and converted into a "PERSON/NATURAL PERSON OPERATING OR IN CHARGE OF AN VEHICLE OR MOTOR VEHICLE under business purpose. *In General Congress Assembled 93 Stat. 1284 and 110 Stat. 3507 punishes persons vested in official authority who aid or cause others to suffer deprivation of rights secured by the Constitution of the United States for America. DEFENDANTS' violated Petitioner/Suitor Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures and Fifth Amendment right to be free from self-incrimination. Under these circumstances, there can be no doubt that Petitioner/Suitor private property, which is Petitioner/Suitor free will and locomotion, was restricted, and constituted an unlawful seizure under the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America. "In 11 Am. Jur., Constitutional Law, § 329, p. 1135 wherein it is said, "Personal liberty largely consists of the right of locomotion -to go where and when one pleases - only so far restrained as the rights of others may make it necessary for the welfare of all other citizens. The right of a Citizen to travel upon the public highways and to transport his property thereon, by horse drawn carriage, wagon, or automobile, is not a mere privilege which may be permitted or prohibited at will, but a common right which he has under his right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Under this constitutional guaranty one may, therefore, under normal conditions, travel at his inclination along the public highways or in public places, and while conducting himself in an orderly and decent manner, neither interfering with nor disturbing another's rights, he will be protected, not only in his person, but in his safe conduct.", ...and unalienable right to come or go from point A to point B was restrained in which constituted as an arrest. 4 American Jurisprudence., Arrest, § 2, contains the following definition: "An arrest is the taking, seizing, or detaining of the person of another, either by touching or putting hands*

on him, or by any act which indicates an intention to take him into custody and subjects the person arrested to the actual control and will of the person making the arrest. . . . However, in all cases in which there is no manual touching or seizure or any resistance, the intentions of the parties to the transaction are very important; there must have been intent on the part of one of them to arrest the other, and intent on the part of such other to submit, under the belief and impression that submission was necessary. . . . "Arrest," as the term is commonly used in the law, has been variously defined by the courts. Perhaps one of the most comprehensive definitions is found in Black's Law Dictionary, 4th ed., which reads *"Taking, under real or assumed authority, custody of another for the purpose of holding or detaining him to answer a criminal charge or civil demand. Ex prate Sherwood, 29 Tex. App. 334, 15 S.W. 812. "Physical seizure of person by arresting officer or submission to officer's authority and control is necessary to constitute an 'arrest."* Thompson v. Boston Pub. Co., 285 Mass. 344, 189 N.E. 210, 213. *"It is a restraint, however slight, on another's liberty to come and go. Turney v. Rhodes, 42 Ga. App. 104, 155 S.E. 112. "It is the taking, seizing or detaining the person of another, touching or putting hands upon him in the execution of process, or any act indicating an intention to arrest.*

The DEFENDANTS' pretextual stop for a non-state commercial license plate violated my Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable searches and seizures as established in Delaware v. Prouse, 440 U.S. 648 (1980). This unlawful stop served as the foundation for the subsequent violations of my constitutional protected and secured inherent rights, interests, and immunities.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of abuse the DEFENDANTS' , "all" the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights, trespass on the case, trespass, and trespass against the person. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision because of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' , "all" .

COUNT CHARGE 3: THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

ASSAULT AND BATTERY NOT LESS THAN MURDER. NEGLIGENT BATTERY. BODILY HARM AND MISUSE OF ARREST POWERS. INVASION OF PYSICAL SECURITY, PRIVACY, AND OPPERSIVE POLICE PRACTICE. CONSTITUTIONAL INVASION

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to Substantial risk by contacting Petitioner/Suitor in an excessive, unwarranted, unpermitted, un-privileged and unjustified means of abuse thru unlawful touch, and actions caused bodily harm not less than or equal to murder to gain compliance thru gross force and abuse.

DEFENDANT, GREGORY BAUER aggressive opening of Petitioner's private automobile door with excessive force constituted a clear violation of Petitioner/Suitor Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America protected and secured right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. This action amounted to gross intimidation and abuse, effectively coercing Petitioner/Suitor to relinquish their free will and comply with DEFENDANT, GREGOTY BAUER demands.

DEFENDANTS' actions of...

1. Gregory Bauer, reaching into Petitioner/Suitor private automobile, grabbing Petitioner/Suitor left wrist with physical hostility, and
2. Gregory Bauer, applied unreasonable force by intentionally yanking Petitioner/Suitor out of the private automobile, and
3. Pinned Petitioner/Suitor face to the concrete forcing Petitioner/Suitor to breathe in street dust from toxic metals that restricted Petitioner/Suitor breathing flow and harming Petitioner/Suitor health and defense system, and
4. Petitioner/Suitor under great stress from the use of deadly force as the DEFENDANTS' aggressively pinning and restraining down on the

The words "force" and "violence" are synonymous and mean any [unlawful] application of physical force against the person of another, even though it causes no pain or bodily harm or leaves no mark and even though only the feelings of such person are injured by the act. The slightest [unlawful] touching, if done in an insolent, rude, or an angry manner, is sufficient. It is not necessary that the touching be done in actual anger or with actual malice; it is sufficient if it was unwarranted and unjustifiable. The touching essential to a battery may be a touching of the person, of the person's clothing, or of something attached to or closely connected with the person. In *Flores-Lopez v. Holder*, 685 F.3d 857, 12 Cal. Daily Op. Serv. 7773, 2012 Daily Journal D.A.R. 9452 (9th Cir. 2012).

"When a word or phrase has been given a particular scope or meaning in one part or portion of a law it shall be given the same scope and meaning in other parts or portions of the law." *People v. McKay*, 27 Cal.4th 601, 621, 622, 117 Cal.Rptr.2d 236, 41 P.3d 59 (2002), *Ortega-Mendez v. Gonzales*, 450 F.3d 1010, 1016 (9th Cir. 2006).

street determined his cruel punishment by impulse, not by necessity, reason, or principle, constituted an unreasonable seizure under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution for America.

5. Defendants' actions clearly exceeded the scope of a permissible frisk and constitutes as an unlawful search.

Petitioner/Suitor fundamental and unalienable rights, interests, and immunities protected by the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution for America were violated.

These rights include the right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures, and the right to be secure in one's personal property, such as a private automobile. *Ortega-Mendez v. Gonzales*, 450 F.3d 1010, 1017 (9th Cir.) "*observing that only a slight unprivileged touching is needed to satisfy the force requirement of a criminal battery*". Because the "*least touching*" may constitute battery, *People v. Mansfield*").

DEFENDANTS' , intentionally, willingly, and knowingly inflicted physical assault and battery upon Petitioner. The DEFENDANTS' combined weight significantly exceeded Petitioner/Suitor weight, creating excessive pressure that crushed or compressed Petitioner/Suitor strain spinal cord. This action exerted immense force upon Petitioner/Suitor cervical, causing traumatic numbness in my right arm daily. Despite Petitioner/Suitor repeated pleas that the DEFENDANTS' aggressive handcuffing technique was damaging my spine, the DEFENDANTS individually ignored these pleas and continued their harmful actions. Ignoring Petitioner/Suitor repeated pleas, the DEFENDANTS continued to apply deadly force by directly crushing Petitioner/Suitor muscles, ligaments, and spine with their combined excessive weight. This egregious physical misconduct, coupled with the malicious and sadistic application of disproportionate force, shocked the conscience.

DEFENDANTS' intrusion into Petitioner/Suitor physical security caused profound shock and stress within Petitioner/Suitor nervous system, resulting in nervousness, anxiety, and a cascade of negative physical and psychological

consequences. This occurred despite the Petitioner/Suitor being unarmed and having no factual evidence presented to DEFENDANTS of any violent or dangerous crime. The DEFENDANTS' actions were based solely on an alleged traffic infraction/traffic offense and/or departmental regulations, further highlighting the disproportionate and unnecessary use of force.

The physical consequences of such stress within the Petitioner/Suitor body include musculoskeletal issues, cardiovascular problems, respiratory difficulties, gastrointestinal disturbances, weakened immune function, sleep disruptions, chronic fatigue, and impaired sexual function. Psychologically, the stress manifested as anxiety, depression, irritability, emotional dysregulation, social isolation, decreased concentration, and chronic pain in right arm, fingers numbness, neckaches.

DEFENDANTS' , under the guise of forced compliance, engaged in the statutory kidnapping of Petitioner/Suitor. They transported the Petitioner/Suitor to an unknown, secure location against Petitioner/Suitor will. DEFENDANT, unknown officer then committed Petitioner/Suitor to the custody of the KENT COUNTY SHERIFF unlawfully. Moreover, DEFENDANTS' , UNKNOWN KENT COUNTY SHERIFF OFFICER' S unlawfully subjected Petitioner/Suitor to unwanted physical contact by forcefully subjecting her to fingerprint her thumb, demonstrating a blatant disregard for her personal autonomy and bodily integrity.

Acting in concert, multiple unidentified KENT COUNTY SHERIFF' S OFFICERS engaged in a coordinated assault on Petitioner/Suitor, intentionally inflicting pain and forcing her into compliance. Despite Petitioner/Suitor to a room where another prisoner was there demonstrating a callous disregard for her well-being and safety. This conduct constitutes a blatant violation of the Petitioner/Suitor's Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protected right against unreasonable search and seizure, and the Eighth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment, but also a gross negligence of battery that caused physical injury. The Court acknowledges *ante at 452 U. S. 702*, "*the record in this case presents no evidence whatsoever that the police feared any threat to their safety or that of others from the conduct of the respondent, or that they could reasonable have so feared. The Court says that this nevertheless was the "kind of transaction that may give rise to sudden violence."* Ibid. But where the police cannot demonstrate, based on specific and articulable facts, a reasonable belief that a person threatens physical harm to them or others, the speculation that other persons in that circumstance might pose such a threat cannot justify a search or seizure. *Ybarra v. Illinois*, 444 U. S. 85, 444 U. S. 92-93.

DEFENDANT police officers engaged in a series of unauthorized physical contacts and forceful touching of Petitioner/Suitor body, constituting a blatant violation of their constitutional rights. These egregious acts demonstrate a disregard for Plaintiff's bodily integrity and autonomy and inflict not only physical harm but also significant emotional distress.

Constitutional violations include...

6. Fourth Amendment right to be free from unreasonable searches and seizures. By forcefully touching and manipulating Petitioner/Suitor's body without consent, the DEFENDANT conducted a de facto "search" in violation of this fundamental inherent rights and interests, and
7. Fifth Amendment right to due process. The Petitioner/Suitor's repeated communication I didn't do anything, and lack of consent should have been respected. The DEFENDANT disregard for these pleas and forced physical contact constituted a violation of due process and the right to remain free from self-incrimination through physical coercion.
8. The subsequent physical encounter, initiated without probable cause and against Petitioner/Suitor repeated protests I didn't do anything, constituted a de facto search and an unlawful violation of Petitioner/Suitor Fifth Amendment protected right to be free from self-incrimination and due process.
9. The DEFENDANT's willful, intentional, and knowing actions to punish, oppress, torture, and unlawfully prosecute Petitioner/Suitor without any lawful basis or conviction amounted to cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment protected rights and interest.
10. The DEFENDANTS' actions also breached 62 Stat. 696, which prohibits depriving individuals of their constitutionally protected rights under the color of law.

These additional instances of misconduct further highlight the egregious (conduct) nature of the DEFENDANTS' actions and their blatant disregard for my fundamental inherent inalienable rights and interests. I further highlight the egregious (conduct) nature of the unprovoked attack by the DEFENDAN did...

11. The attack caused me, the Petitioner/Suitor, physical injury and constituted oppressive police practices. This included arresting and

searching me without probable cause, resulting in serious personal injuries and/or grave irreparable property damage.

12. Such practices circumvent judicial control and elevate police power above the law, as recognized in *Henry v. United States*, 361 U.S. 98, 100-102 (1960). This circumvention directly contradicts the fundamental principle of a balanced legal system.
13. The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution for America guarantees the security of the people against arbitrary and invasive acts by the government and its agents. This guarantee extends to situations where an officer abuses their authority and employs unnecessary force and violence, as established in:
 - a. *Jones v. State*, 26 Tex. App. 1: This case highlights the illegality of using excessive force during an arrest.
 - b. *Beavers v. Taylor*, 31 Ga. 858 (1861): This case emphasizes that even an officer acting under the color of law cannot use excessive force without legal consequences.
 - c. *Johnson v. District of Columbia*, 392 A.2d 1369 (D.C. 1978): This case reinforces the principle that excessive force by an officer constitutes a violation of the Fourth Amendment.
14. Violation of Fourth Amendment: The DEFENDANT actions, including the unprovoked attack and arrest without probable cause, constituted a blatant violation of my Fourth Amendment right against unreasonable searches and seizures. This right guarantees the security of the people against arbitrary and invasive acts by the government and its agents, as established in numerous precedents, including *Delaware v. Prouse*, 440 U.S. 648 (1980).
15. Battery and Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress: The intentional and offensive touching by the officers amounted to battery, regardless of their intent to cause harm. Actual damage is not required for a battery claim, as established in *POLICE CIVIL LIABILITY REL 88-5/2014. PUB 543. 6.02[1], 6-6*. Additionally, the actions of the officers caused me significant emotional distress, which constitutes a separate cause of action.
16. Violation of Fifth Amendment Right: As public servants funded by taxpayers, the Defendants have a duty to protect the people and uphold the law. Instead, their actions in assaulting and battering me violated my Fifth Amendment right to be free from cruel and unusual punishment, as established in *Whitley v. Deal*, 514 U.S. 363 (1995).

17. Misuse of Arrest Powers: Furthermore, the Defendants' misuse of their arrest powers to detain me without probable cause and subject me to unnecessary force constitutes a further violation of my constitutional rights. This abuse of power undermines the very foundation of a just legal system and cannot be tolerated.

Petitioner/Suitor further highlight the egregious (conduct) nature of the unprovoked attack by the DEFENDANTS' :

18. The attack caused me, the Petitioner/Suitor, physical injury and constituted oppressive police practices. This included arresting and searching me without probable cause, resulting in serious personal injuries and/or grave irreparable property damage.
 - a. Such practices circumvent judicial control and elevate police power above the law, as recognized in *Henry v. United States*, 361 U.S. 98, 100-102 (1960). This circumvention directly contradicts the fundamental principle of a balanced legal system.
 - b. The Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution for America guarantees the security of the people against arbitrary and invasive acts by the government and its agents. This guarantee extends to situations where an officer abuses their authority and employs unnecessary force and violence.
 - c. As established in *Miranda v. Arizona*, 384 U.S. 436 (1966), Petitioner/Suitor has the absolute right to remain silent and to have counsel present during police interrogation. This right extends to any situation where an individual is deprived of their free-will of movement in a significant way, regardless of whether they are formally under arrest, you do not treat a human that way.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights from ASSAULT AND BATTERY. NEGLIGENCE BATTERY. BODILY HARM AND MISUSE OF ARREST POWERS. INVASION OF PHYSICAL SECURITY, PRIVACY, AND OPPRESSIVE POLICE PRACTICE. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was

prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision because of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' .

COUNT CHARGE 4: FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

THE INVOLUNTARY SUMISSION TO CUSTODY. ILLEGAL STOP. WARRANTLESS ARRESTS WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE, ILLEGAL HAND CUFFING, FALSE ARREST, UNLAWFUL SEIZURE, UNLAWFUL SEARCH, FALSE/UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT, KIDNAPPING AND UNLAWFULFUL IMPRISONMENY BY SECRET CONFINEMENT, WRONGFUL CONFINEMENT UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, FALSE DETENTION COLOR OF LAW. FORCED PYSICAL DISCOMFORT.CONSTITUSIONAL INVASION. INVOLUNATRY SERVITUDE. CONSTITUTIONAL INVASION.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, Matthew 5:33 Don' t break your oath, but keep the oath you have made to the Lord; and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to the following.

1. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to punish Petitioner/Suitor for having exercised constitutional protected and secured rights, interest and immunities to confront and question the performance of the public servant, the peace officer/police officer/law enforcement officer during the unlawful stop, and

2. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to viciously assault Petitioner/Suitor with excessive force to unlawfully handcuff, perform unlawful search and seizure, and to arrest, and
3. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to undertake a course of conduct to restrain Petitioner/Suitor personal mobility, effectively depriving Petitioner/Suitor of free will, and
4. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to forcing Petitioner/Suitor to restrict Petitioner/Suitor movements and by force to gain compliance for Petitioner/Suitor to involuntarily submit to their custody and verbal communication, and
5. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to forcing Petitioner/Suitor to arrest and imprison Petitioner/Suitor without warrant, and intentionally falsely.
6. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to seize illegally. Petitioner/Suitor has a fundamental inherent natural right to be secured in her private property, her automobile, and for seizure of her body, and personal properties. Petitioner/Suitor body and personal properties were located in an area where there is an expectation of privacy and the DEFENDANTS were required to have a warrant, and
7. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to forcing Petitioner/Suitor to unlawfully take and transported Petitioner/Suitor to a secret location against Petitioner/Suitor will to an unknown building in an enclosed area that was not visible to anyone who might have been passing by, and
8. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to unlawfully commit Petitioner/Suitor without her consent to be committed to the KENT COUNTY SHERIFF for Petitioner/Suitor to be unlawfully booked, processed, and detained, and

9. DEFENDANTS' KENT COUNTY UNKNOWN OFFICERS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to be the jailers assigned to securing the custody and control of the Petitioner/Suitor and solely responsible for granting access to the holding area and phone access, and
10. DEFENDANTS' KENT COUNTY UNKNOWN OFFICERS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to deny Petitioner/Suitor due process and deprived her of rights. Approximately for hours the Petitioner/Suitor was secretly confined, and prevented from giving awareness to her family members of her specific location, and
11. DEFENDANTS' KENT COUNTY UNKNOWN OFFICERS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of the assistance of others including family members by virtue of the Petitioner/Suitor inability to communicate her predicament, (an unpleasant situation that made it seem like I couldn' t get out unless I paid high price alleged debt) and
12. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to actions in falsely arresting, searching, and detaining Plaintiff constituted a clear violation of Plaintiff's Fourth Amendment right to be free from unlawful searches and seizures, and intentional nonconsensual invasion of my interest to be free from harmful or offensive bodily conduct. This fundamental right protects individuals from arbitrary and unwarranted intrusions by law enforcement officials, see Terry v. Ohio, 392 U.S. 1 (1968) and
13. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to actions in falsely imprisoning Petitioner/Suitor further violated Plaintiff's Fifth Amendment right to due process of law. Due process requires that individuals be treated fairly and with respect for their rights, including the right to be free from arbitrary detention.
14. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to justify for the Petitioner/Suitor's detention based on alleged disobedience is entirely

unfounded and cannot serve to legitimize the violation of Petitioner/Suitor protected and secured constitutional rights, interests, and immunities.

15. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to violate Petitioner/Suitor the accusation by failing to state the nature of the crime underlying the illegal arrest.
16. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to obtain a warrant based on probable cause, which is a fundamental requirement for a lawful arrest.
17. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to failure to provide Petitioner/Suitor with adequate notice of the charges against person CAROLYN JEAN BURNETT, depriving Petitioner/Suitor the protected and the United secured Sixth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America, the right to a fair trial.
18. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to use the concept of "reasonable suspicion," that is not explicitly stated in the Constitution of the United States for America. It has been recognized by the Supreme Court as a standard that may justify a brief investigatory stop. However, reasonable suspicion is of a lower standard than probable cause and cannot be used as the basis for an arrest.

Threat to the administration of justice

Amendment XIII

- Section 1. Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction. Section 2. Congress shall have power to enforce this article with appropriate legislation.

The Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 14141 in the pattern or practice of police abuse, unconstitutional excessive force, false arrests, false reports, and illegal searches by PEACE or POLICE OFFICER' S OF STATE OF MICHIGAN CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS constitutes domestic terrorism.

There is no single, universally accepted definition of terrorism. Terrorism is defined in the Code of Federal Regulations as "...the unlawful use of force and violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives." (28 C.F.R. Section 0.85)

TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 113B > § 2331 § 2331. Definitions

(5) the term “domestic terrorism” means activities that—

(A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State.

(B) appear to be intended—

(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT’ S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights from THE INVOLUNTARY SUBMISSION TO CUSTODY. ILLEGAL STOP. WARRANTLESS ARRESTS WITHOUT PROBABLE CAUSE, ILLEGAL HAND CUFFING, FALSE ARREST, UNLAWFUL SEIZURE, UNLAWFUL SEARCH, FALSE/UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT, KIDNAPPING AND UNLAWFUL IMPRISONMENT BY SECRET CONFINEMENT, WRONGFUL CONFINEMENT UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, FALSE DETENTION. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS’ .

COUNT CHARGE 5: FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

PROBABLE CAUSE PROCEEDING VIOLATION. DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW. CONSTITUTIONAL INVASION.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS’ , “all” who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities Matthew 5:33 Don’ t break your oath, keep the oath you have made to the Lord, of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS’ , “all” without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS’ , “all” willfully, knowingly and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS’ , “all” knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to violate due process and deprive Petitioner/Suitor of probable cause due process.

DEFENDANTS' "all" actions bypassed the essential probable cause proceedings and resulted in an unlawful arrest, including did seizing Petitioner/Suitor private property, i.e. free-will, physical body, physical security, united states passport, lawful documents, floating rate notes united states dollars, law books (food, dinner trays, juice, key, private plate), automobile oil and washer fluid. DEFENDANTS "all" presented no evidence that the above private properties were directly or indirectly dangerous to the public health and safety to violate due process protected and secured inalienable inherent natural rights, immunities, and interest. DEFENDANTS "all" presented no evidence that the above private properties were proceeds of a crime or instrumentality of a crime to violate due process protected and secured inalienable inherent natural rights, immunities and interests. DEFENDANTS "all" presented no evidence that the above private properties were subject in favor to the STATE OF MICHIGAN in forfeiture proceeding, was contraband, was part of an ownership dispute or held as evidence or a crime to violate due process protected and secured inalienable inherent natural rights, immunities, and interest.

The United States Constitution for America Amendment IV clearly states, "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue but upon probable cause supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to e searched and the persons or things being seized," see People ex rel. Roth v. Younger, 327 Mich. 410, 42 N.W. 2d 120 (1950). DEFENDANTS' "all" willful and wanton misconduct of violating the Constitution of the United States for America guarantee and protection against unlawfully search and seizure of private property. DEFENDANTS "all" did unlawfully violate due process y omission of...

1. Filing any complaint, affidavit or by sworn statement of information upon belief presented to article III tribunal on accusations that a crime has been committed to institute an investigation and to interrogate, and
2. Article III tribunal then reviews the evidence and decides based on the totality of the circumstances. This process, known as an ex parte hearing,

ensures that the people are not subjected to unwarranted arrests or searches, and

3. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasized that due process of law guarantees the right to be heard and the right to challenge accusations. In *Coleman v. Burnett*, 459 U.S. 130 (1983), the Court held that the denial of a probable cause hearing violated an individual's Fourth Amendment rights.
4. The accused was to be directly brought before an article III tribunal along with the DEFENDANTS' "all" and with other witnesses, as the accuser presents evidence and facts that a crime was committed and for the accused to be heard, and
5. By proper process of a trial by jury with the article III tribunal to hear and determine any criminal violations, and upon sufficient findings and acts the article III tribunal writes up written findings setting up the criminal violations to issue a search, seizure and arrest warrant under probable cause that a crime was committed and serves it to the Sheriff of Kent County, Michigan, and that
6. Petitioner/Suitor was not afforded the Constitutional guarantee to face any accusers', to be heard, to challenge, to defend, to assert and affirm fundamental inherent unalienable rights, interest and immunities before prosecutions i.e. arrest, search, seizure, kidnap and statutory kidnap, rape and statutory rape, unfound charges, involuntary servitude and slavery under peonage, misclassification of political status and nationality, detention, unlawful touching, unlawful handcuffing, physical assault and battery not less than murder, theft of property, and
7. Before an issuance of process, the DEFENDANTS "all" are witnesses, no more or no less, and
8. The Petitioner/Suitor had fundamental inherent inalienable right to a probable cause proceeding and the absence of proceeding and special appearance to a probable cause proceeding Petitioner/Suitor resulted in prejudice.
9. The Supreme Court has consistently emphasized the importance of due process of law, including the right to be heard and the right to challenge the charges against one. In *Coleman v. Burnett*, 459 U.S. 130 (1983), the Court held that the denial of a hearing to determine probable cause violated an individual's Fourth Amendment rights.

DEFENDANTS' "all" actions were a blatant disregard for Petitioner/Suitor inherent fundamental inherent human rights, interests, and immunities. Their unlawful arrest, search, seizure, kidnap and statutory kidnap, rape and statutory rape, unfound charges, involuntary servitude and slavery under peonage, misclassification

of political status and nationality, detention, unlawful touching, unlawful handcuffing, and physical assault and battery not less than murder, theft of property constitute a serious violation of Plaintiff's Fourth, Fifth, and Eighth Amendment rights. Plaintiff is entitled to redress for these violations, including compensation for damages.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights from PROBABLE CAUSE PROCEEDING VIOLATION. DUE PROCESS VIOLATION AND DEPRIVATION OF RIGHTS UNDER COLOR OF LAW. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision because of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS "all" .

COUNT CHARGE 6: SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:

SEXUAL BATTERY. SEXUAL INTIMIDATION, SEXUAL ASSAULT, EMOTIONAL RAPE. FORCED PHYSICAL DISCOMORT.

Said actions by DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, (Matthew 5:33 Don' t break your oath, but keep the oath you have made to the Lord) and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS, Gregory Bauer willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer under the guise of his official authority, the police officer engaged in a deliberate and egregious act of misconduct, violating Petitioner/Suitor' s fundamental inherent natural constitutional rights, interests and immunities to due process and bodily autonomy.

While Petitioner/Suitor was unlawfully restrained against her will, DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer willfully and unlawfully touched intimate parts of her body, constituting a blatant invasion of privacy and a shocking violation of bodily integrity. Despite Petitioner/Suitor's explicit and repeated pleas, DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer under the color of his authority, engaged in a deliberate and invasive act of unauthorized touching. Petitioner/Suitor clearly communicated discomfort with his gender and expressed unwillingness to be touched, by stating, "there is a female officer", "you do not have a right to touch my body" and "I do not give you consent to touch my body". This blatant disregard for Petitioner/Suitor bodily autonomy and repeated refusals constitutes a shocking violation of the Fourth Amendment protection of inalienable inherent fundamental rights, interests, and immunities to be free from being non-consensually touched, as well as their Fifth Amendment protection of inalienable inherent fundamental rights, interests, and immunities to due process. Furthermore, Petitioner/Suitor belief that DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer actions were motivated by sexual gratification or abuse raises serious concerns of Eighth Amendment protection of inalienable inherent fundamental rights, interests and immunities of cruel and unusual punishment. This egregious act constitutes a grave violation of Plaintiff's Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, and Fourteenth Amendment rights. *Ortega-Mendez v. Gonzales*, 450 F.3d 1010, 1017 (9th Cir. 2006) ("[a]ny person who touches an intimate part of another person while that person is unlawfully restrained by the accused or an accomplice, and if the touching is against the will of the person touched and is for the purpose of sexual arousal, sexual gratification, or sexual abuse, is guilty of sexual battery, The touching essential to a battery may be a touching of the person, of the person's clothing, or of something attached to or closely connected with the person. ")

Despite repeated and explicit pronouncements of "No" and clear notice of non-consent, a male police officer, acting under the color of his authority, engaged in a blatant and forceful violation of Petitioner/Suitor's bodily autonomy and privacy. This egregious misconduct involved the DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer non-consensual touching and harassment of Petitioner/Suitor's private property, her body, at the scene of the stop. This act of unconscionable emotional and punitive assault constitutes a shocking violation of Fifth Amendment protection of deprivation of liberty without due process of law. "To compel anyone, and especially a woman, to submit it to the touch of a stranger without lawful authority is an indignity, an assault, and a trespass, and no order of process commanding such an exposure or submission was ever known to the common law in the administration of justice between individuals" See. *Union Pacific Railway Co. v. Botsford*, 141 U.S. 250 (1891).

DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer deliberate and unwelcome touch upon Petitioner/Suitor body constituted a flagrant violation of her fundamental inherent natural right to bodily autonomy, privacy, and freedom from compelled speech. This egregious act was not simply a physical intrusion, but an assault on Petitioner/Suitor very existence, silencing her voice and dignity under the color of authority.

DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer unconscionable act of invading Petitioner/Suitor bodily autonomy was not justified under any pretense of suspicion or law. The Constitution of the United States for America and its core principles of due process and individual liberty strictly limit the scope of police intervention. Suspicion of a crime, by its very nature, is a statutory construct, not a constitutional justification for unwarranted touching and violation of personal dignity.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT, Gregory Bauer, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the sexual battery, sexual intimidation, sexual assault, emotional rape and forced physical discomfort. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision because of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer.

COUNT CHARGE 7. SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF: INVASION OF PRIVACY. RACIAL PROFILING.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with

others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to deprive Petitioner/Suitor inherent fundamental inalienable natural rights, interest and immunities.

1. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct that constituted a flagrant and deliberate violation of Petitioner/Suitor's fundamental right to privacy, enshrined and protected in the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of United States for America. This egregious act, predicated upon unfounded charges and driven by apparent malicious intent, inflicted profound harm.
2. DEFENDANTS' acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to subject Petitioner/Suitor to a discriminatory traffic stop based on her race, gender and ethnicity, that violated the Bill of Rights protection to equal protection. This incident falls within pattern of disproportionate police interactions with the indigenous people of the Americas in colloquial term called "black people".
3. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to demand for Petitioner/Suitor's bank and financial information without a warrant. This egregious act constituted a direct assault on Petitioner/Suitor's constitutionally protected and secured privacy and due process, in the Fourth and Fifth Amendments o the Constitution of United States for America.
4. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to transcend.
5. U.S. Constitution Article Six, clause 2:
6. the bounds of lawful investigation by subjecting Petitioner/Suitor to a coerced ordeal of unwarranted fingerprinting, voice recording, and photographic documentation, all stemming from an illegal arrest and imprisonment demonstrably lacking in probable cause. This egregious violation of Petitioner/Suitor's Fourth and Fifth Amendment protected and secured inherent fundamental inalienable rights, interest and immunities encompassing the right to be freed from unreasonable search and seizure and protection against self-incrimination.
7. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer publication of a police report demonstrably riddled with untrue and unfounded allegations constitutes a flagrant and injurious act of defamation against Petitioner/Suitor. These demonstrably false statements, released to the public and readily accessible on the ACCESS KENT COUNTY website, constitutes a direct assault on Petitioner/Suitor's reputation and character, implicating them in potential violations without a shred of legitimate evidence. Such a brazen disregard for truth and due process, enshrined in the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America and Bill of Rights guarantees and protects of equal protection and to be freed from false light. *"Any misstatement o fact is known to be untrue when made, or which is made reckless disregard o the truth is actionable"*, in Police Civil Liability, Rel. 4-12/2010. Ub. 543, I-43, 1.07[2].

The DEFENDANTS' "all" self-serving assertion of disobedience cannot obfuscate the blatant violation of my fundamental inherent inalienable rights, interests and

immunities protected by the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America to be free from unreasonable seizure. Acting under the color of law, DEFENDANTS "all" engaged in a coordinated act of misconduct that transcended the bounds of their individual capacities. Their pretexts of non-compliance are demonstrably disingenuous and cannot justify the egregious deprivation of my liberty. The Constitution of the United States for America guarantees Petitioner/Suitor to be free from arbitrary detainment, and this right cannot be conditioned upon Petitioner/Suitor engagement with, or submission to, DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer unlawful demands to (1) produce driver's license and registration, (2) to participate in DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer interrogation or interview by answering his questions, (3) to get out my private automobile and be subject to seizure and search. The DEFENDANTS' unconscionable conduct transcended the bounds of lawful action, subjecting Petitioner/Suitor to a grossly egregious invasion of my privacy under the pretext of unlawful handcuffing, false arrest, kidnapping and statutory kidnapping, human trafficking, false detention unlawful imprisonment that caused profound mental anguish and emotional distress, the very essence of a privacy violation. DEFENDANTS' "all actions were demonstrably devoid of good faith and constituted a flagrant assault on my protected and secured right to privacy, encompassing physical security, personal security, and the sanctity of my natural privacy.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANTS', the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights from invasion of privacy and racial profiling UNDER COLOR OF LAW. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS "all".

COUNT CHARGE 8. EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

MALICIOUS PROSECUTION and CONSPIRACY TO MALICIOUSLY PROSECUTE. DEFAMATION OF CHARACTER. FILING FABRICATING EVIDENCE TO INCRIMINATE ON ERRONEOUS CHARGES. UNCONSCIONABLE CONTRACT, FRAUD IN THE FACTUM. MALICIOUS INTERERENCE WITH CONTRACT. SECURITY FRAUD. CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS', "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS', "all" without consent and

without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to violate due process and deprive Petitioner/Suitor of inherent fundamental inalienable natural rights, interests and immunities.

1. DEFENDANTS' "all" acting in their individual and official capacities, and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct that transcended mere negligence, amounting to a malicious and deliberate act of fabrication and falsehood designed to injure Petitioner/Suitor reputation. While Petitioner/Suitor had the inherent right to exercise the fundamental and natural right to travel, Petitioner/Suitor was subjected to unlawful handcuffing, detainment, unlawful arrest, unlawful kidnap and statutory kidnap, unlawful human trafficking, unlawfully being committed, unlawful imprisonment and peonage under blatant disregard for probable cause process and procedural safeguards. Such flagrant abuse of power maliciously violated the Bill of Rights and Fourth, Fifth, Eighth, Ninth and Tenth constitutional protections of secured inherent, fundamental, inherent rights, interests and immunities.
2. DEFENDANTS' "all" ostensibly acting under color of law but demonstrably exceeding their individual and official capacities, engaged in a concerted and malicious undertaking aimed at the egregious violation of fundamental, inherent, natural rights, interests, and immunities. This coordinated act manifested in a spurious criminal and civil prosecution based on fabricated unfounded charges. The weaponization of the commercial system enforced by colorable police power is a brazen disregard to the fundamental Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States for America protection.
3. DEFENDANTS' "all" in individual and official capacity conspired and acted in concert under color of law and authority to maliciously and without constitutional grounds therefore initiated colorable legal processes to prosecute Petitioner/Suitor which was retaliatory, vindictive and calculated to damage Petitioner/Suitor and to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of her liberty, due process and substantive due process protected rights, interests and immunities under the Bill of Rights and Fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America.
4. DEFENDANTS' "all" in individual and official capacity conspired and acted in concert under color of law and authority to maliciously misuse and abuse colorable legal process or the ulterior purpose of damaging Petitioner/Suitor as well as protecting themselves from liability for illegal and unjustified excessive use of force which individual DEFENDANT' S utilized in arresting and imprisoning Petitioner/Suitor, thereby depriving Petitioner/Suitor of her

liberty, due process and substantial due process protected rights, interests and immunities under the Bill of Rights and Fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America

5. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer intentionally misrepresented information contained in the police report", (See Kalina v. Fletcher, 118 S.Ct. 502 (1997) and in this affidavit, "*materially false statements either knowingly or in reckless disregard for the truth*") see Bruning v. Pixler, 949 F.2d 352, 357 (10th Cir. 1910). "*The law was clear that an officer would violate a plaintiff's Fourth and Amendment protected rights by knowingly or recklessly making a false statement in an affidavit in support of an arrest*") see, Olson v. Tyler, 771 F.2d 277 (7th Cir. 1985). The "*Fourth Amendment violated when arrest based on false reports*", see Tribble v. Sanchez, 1996 WL 496603 (N.D. Ill. 1996).

Under false representation to prosecute DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer and DEFENDANTS' KENT COUNTY UNKNOWN SHERIFF did,

- a. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did state BURNETT, CAROLYN JEAN "PERSON" by statutory definition as the party involved and did arrest the soul in gross materialism as the physical woman under offenses for the "PERSON" BURNETT, CAROLYN JEAN, and
- b. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did charge to lien "PERSON" BURNETT, CAROLYN JEAN for ASSAULT, BATTER, RESIST OR OBSTRUCT A POLICE OFFICER, FAIL OR REFUSE TO OBEY A LAWFUL ORDER OF A POLICE OFFICER, FAIL OR REFUSE TO IDENTIFY ONESELF TO A POLICE OFFICER, DRIVING OFFENSES (NOOPS ON PERS/OTHER DR),
- c. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did charge to lien "PERSON" UNDER ORDINANCES UNDER TICKET NUMBER 23Z692121 FOR NO PROOF OF INSURANCE AND ASSAULT, BATTER, RESIST POLICE, and
- d. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did charge to lien "PERSON" UNDER ORDINANCES UNDER TICKET NUMBER 23Z692121 FOR FAILURE TO PROVIDE IDENTIFICATION UPON DIRECTION OF A PEACE OFFICER (VEHICLE), FAIL TO OBEY LAWFUL COMMAND OF A PEACE OFFICER, IMPROPER ATTACHMENT OR DISPLAY OF PLATE, and
- e. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did violate the elements of a contract and forced contracts TICKET NUMBERS 23Z692121 and 23Z692121 upon Petitioner/Suitor, and
- f. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did create, did force an unconscionable contract upon Petitioner/Suitor and did unlawfully assign Petitioner/Suitor as surety under involuntary servitude and slavery under peonage for an indebtedness, and
- g. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did create and force an incomplete and void contract with incomplete terms such as, "TICKET NUMBERS 23Z692121 and 23Z692121 terms and agreement are unreadable, DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did not check the box and sign in wet ink his signature the "I served a copy of the civil infraction complaint upon the defendant and that I declare under the penalties of perjury that the statements are true to the best of my information, knowledge and belief, citations are to provide explanations and instructions on the back side of instrument and the back side is blank, and the contract provided no address, that

- h. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did provide false statements that "PERSON" BURNETT, CAROLYN JEAN RACE as "Black" to maliciously issue bonds to civilly prosecute, and
- i. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did provide false statements that "PERSON" BURNETT, CAROLYN JEAN a "Driver" to maliciously issue bonds to civilly prosecute, and
- j. DEFENDANT Andrew Middleton did provide false statements that "PERSON" BURNETT, CAROLYN JEAN as positive ID TYPE by "Driver' s License" MICHIGAN B653108385714 to issue bonds to civilly prosecute, and
- k. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did provide false statements identifying Petitioner/Suitor as a sole occupant of the Ram is "driver" "vehicle" to issue bonds to civilly prosecute, an
- l.
- m. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did provide false statements that, "I advised Burnett that she was under arrest for failing to provide a driver' s license", to issue bonds to civilly prosecute, and
- n. DEFENDANT Gregory Bauer did provide false statements that, "I told Burnett to place her hands on top of her head and to turn the vehicle off. At no point in time did Burnett ever place her hands on top of her head. I opened the driver' s side of the Ram to place Burnett under arrest. I formed a wrist lock utilizing both of my hands around Burnett' s left wrist, I pulled her out the vehicle. Burnett on to her knees and immediately became compliant. She was arrested in handcuffs (FCDL/searched) Nothing illegal was located on Burnett' s person. Burnett didn' t want to speak to me regarding the circumstance of the incident. Sgt. Manser briefly spoke with Burnett reference the circumstance. Was updated of the circumstances and responded to the scene shortly thereafter. Burnett' s vehicle was inventory searched. I transported Burnett tp KCCF without incident where she was lodged to fail to obey (\$100.00 bond), resist and obstruct (\$100.00 bond, no driver' s license on her person (\$100.00 bond). Burnett was also issued a civil infraction failing to provide insurance and no registration plate on the Malibu. Burnett was issued a copy of both tickets" to issue bonds to civilly prosecute.
- o. DEFENDANT KENT COUNTY SHERIFF did provide false statements that, CAROLYN JEAN as a DISORDERLY PERSON to issue bonds to civilly prosecute, and
- p. DEFENDANT KENT COUNTY SHERIFF did provide false statements that, CAROLYN JEAN or DISORDERLY CONDUCT, to issue bonds to civilly prosecute, and
- q. DEFENDANT KENT COUNTY SHERIFF did provide false statements that BURNETT, CARMIE RONATA resisted & obstructed to issue bonds to civilly prosecute.

DEFENDANT, ANDREW MIDDLETON, RYAN MANSER and KENT COUNTY SHERIFF unknown officers were malicious in conducting false, fictitious, or fraudulent information willfully and knowingly, see - 118 Stat. 3764 section 1038 .

(1) Falsifying, concealing, and covering up by any trick, scheme, or device a material fact. DEFENDANTS' GREGORY BAUER, and KENT COUNTY SHERIFF unknown

officers did not disclose to Petitioner/Suitor that the bonds that were issued to be created as securities and sold. DEFENDANTS' GREGORY BAUER, and UNKNOWN KENT COUNTY SHERIFF did not disclose to Petitioner/Suitor

(2) Made materially false, fictitious, and fraudulent statement and representation with no evidence, and

(3) Made and used false writing and document knowing the same to contain any materially false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement and entries in police report, fast track release form and citation.

The DEFENDANTS' "all" flagrant abuse of power culminated in a malicious invasion of Petitioner/Suitor's fundamental right to personal liberty through an egregious and unwarranted arrest. This unconscionable act, yielding nothing incriminating, laid bare the stark reality of an unconstitutional police practice, one that tramples upon procedural fairness and racial equality with impunity. Such brazen disregard for legal safeguards and human rights can't be tolerated. As recognized in 6 J.L. & Pol'y 21, 297-298 (1997), this systemic injustice demands immediate redress and decisive action to dismantle discriminatory practices and uphold the fundamental rights of all. Petitioner/Suitor unlawful stop, detention, handcuffing, arrest, search, seizure, kidnap and statutory kidnap, human trafficking, peonage and imprisonment raise serious concerns about racial profiling, given the documented ineffectiveness of this practice in law enforcement. The disproportional representation of police officers in this predominantly Black community, coupled with the nature and extent of the interaction, strongly suggests the possibility of bias in violation of Petitioner/Suitor protections of rights, interests and immunities by the Bill of Rights and Fourth Amendment of the constitution of the United States for America. This issue demands thorough investigation and decisive action to address systemic inequities within the justice system and the "frightening abuse of power" and "frightening abuse of power" to civilly and criminally prosecute. Furthermore, reasonable caution to believe, probable cause to believe, reasonable suspicion, reasonable prudence to believe is statutory in nature is malicious prosecution and constitutional invasion.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights from malicious prosecution, conspiracy to maliciously prosecute, defamation of character, filing fabricating evidence to incriminate on erroneous charges, unconscionable contract, fraud in the factum, malicious interference with contract and security fraud under color of law. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and

held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all" .

COUNT 9. NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to violate due process and deprive Petitioner/Suitor of inherent fundamental inalienable natural rights, interests and immunities.

DEFENDANTS "all" did Breach Fiduciary Duty. Petitioner/Suitor affirm that DEFENDANTS "all" are Trustees of the Public Trust and bound by oath to obey the Constitution of The United States of America and the State.

PUBLIC OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES ARE PUBLIC TRUSTEES AS FIDUCIARIES OF THE PUBLIC TRUST

- 63C Am. Jur. 2d, Public Officers and Employees, § 247 "As expressed otherwise, the powers delegated to a public officer are held in trust for the people and are to be exercised on behalf of the government or of all citizens who may need the intervention of the officer.

5 CFR § 2635.101 - Basic obligation of public service. § 2635.101 Basic obligation of public service.

(a) Public service is a public trust. Each employee has a responsibility to the United States Government and its citizens to place loyalty to the Constitution,

(b) Laws and ethical principles above private gain. To ensure that every citizen can have complete confidence in the integrity of the Federal Government, each employee shall respect and adhere to the principles of ethical conduct set forth in this

section, as well as the implementing standards contained in this part and in supplemental agency regulations.

(b) General principles. The following general principles apply to every employee and may form the basis for the standards contained in this part. Where a situation is not covered by the standards set forth in this part, employees shall apply the principles set forth in this section in determining whether their conduct is proper.

(1) Public service is a public trust, requiring employees to place loyalty to the Constitution, the laws and ethical principles above private gain.

- **Breach of Fiduciary Duty;** Breach of trust is a trustee's failure to act in accordance with the terms of the trust or the trustee's general fiduciary obligations. The trustee is subject to removal in the case of breach of trust and creates personal liability. Whether or not the violation was willful, fraudulent, negligent, or inadvertent, a trustee is said to have committed breach of trust if a duty imposed on him/her by equity was violated.

Furthermore, it has been stated that any enterprise undertaken by the public official who tends to weaken public confidence and undermine the sense of security for individual rights is against public policy. Fraud in its elementary common law sense of deceit--and this is one of the meanings that fraud bears [483 U.S. 372] in the statute.

- See [United States v. Dial, 757 F.2d 163, 168 (7th Cir1985)] the deliberate concealment of material information in a setting of fiduciary obligation. A public official is a fiduciary toward the public, including, the judge, in reference to litigants who appear before him and he deliberately concealed material information from them, he was guilty of fraud. [McNally v United States 483 U.S. 350 (1987)].

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT'S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights from BREACH OF FIDUCIARY DUTY UNDER COLOR OF LAW. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS "all".

COUNT CHARGE 10. TENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF VIOLATION OF OATH

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to violate due process and deprive Petitioner/Suitor of inherent fundamental inalienable natural rights, interests and immunities. DEFENDANTS' "all" demonstrably breached their fundamental duty to uphold and protect the constitutional rights, interests and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor, an Indigenous American. This egregious act, transcending a mere oath violation, constituted a direct assault on Petitioner/Suitor's guaranteed free-will and immunities secured by the Constitution of the United States for America. Such blatant disregard for constitutional obligations and c human rights cannot be tolerated. The intentional deprivation of these fundamental rights, interests and immunities especially against a historically marginalized group, demands immediate redress and accountability. This blatant violation rises to the level of a felony and necessitates swift and decisive action to enforce the rule of law and protect against discriminatory practices within the justice system. "In America the police officer's oath originates within the United States Constitution for America" (Appendix A).

The title of executive officers mentioned in the constitution refers to police officers working under the executive branch of the government. In the United States Constitution under Article IV, it states:

"The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution..."

(U. S. Constitution 1787)

The State of Michigan also covers language requiring an oath of office before entering upon the duties of a police officer. Article XI, sec.1 in the Constitution of the State of Michigan (Appendix B), states; "All officers, legislative, executive and judicial, before

entering upon the duties of their respective officers, shall take and subscribe the following oath or affirmation:

I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support the Constitution 7 of the United States and the constitution of this state, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of _____ according to the best of my ability..."

(Constitution of the State of Michigan 1835)

It is quite clear that both the U. S. Constitution and the Michigan Constitution hold police officers and politicians accountable for their actions.

If the oath is such an important word and referred to in both Constitutions, it is our job to know and understand what this word means.

The American Dictionary of the English Language, define an oath as:

"A solemn affirmation or declaration made with an appeal to God for truth of what is affirmed. The appeal to God in an oath, implies that the person imprecates his vengeance and renounces his favor if the declaration is false, or if the declaration is a promise, the person invokes the vengeance of God if he should fail to fulfill it. A false oath is called perjury."

Michigan Constitution Official oath or affirmation, form.

Members of the legislature, and all officers, executive and judicial, except such inferior officers as may by laws be exempted, shall, before they enter on the duties of their respective offices, take and subscribe the following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear, or affirm, (as the case may be) that I will support the constitution of the United States and the constitution of this state, and that I will faithfully discharge the duties of the office of _____ according to the best of my ability." And no other oath, declaration, or test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust.

Grand Rapids Police Department (GRPD) officers 'and Kent County Sheriff officers 'are Trustee' s acting both in their individual and official capacities, demonstrably breached their sacred trust as Public Trustees of the public trust by engaging in a willful and egregious violation of Petitioner/Suitor's constitutionally guaranteed protected inherent fundamental unalienable rights, interests, and immunities. This blatant act of misconduct, transcending a mere oath violation, constituted a felonious betrayal of their sworn duty to uphold the Constitution of the United States for America and the Constitution of the State of Michigan. The following oath or affirmation: "I do solemnly swear, or affirm, that I will uphold the constitution of the United States and the constitution of this state of Michigan.

VIOLATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

See 78 Stat. 995, 90 Stat. 2534 section 931 Article 131, for Perjury. Federal law regulating oath of office by government officials is divided into four parts along with an executive order which further defines the law for purposes of enforcement. 80 Statute 424 section 3331 provides the text of the actual oath of office members of Congress are required to take before assuming office. 80 Statute 424 section 3333 requires members of Congress sign an

affidavit that they have taken the oath of office required by 80 Statute 424 section 3331 and have not or will not violate that oath of office during their tenure of office as defined by the third part of the law, 80 Statute 424 section which explicitly makes it a federal criminal offense (and a violation of oath of office) for anyone employed in the United States Government (including members of Congress) to "advocate the overthrow of our constitutional form of government". The fourth federal law, 18 U.S.C. 1918 provides penalties for violation of oath office described in 80 Statute 424 section 3333 which include: (1) removal from office and (2) confinement or a fine. "Economic necessity cannot justify a disregard of Constitutional guarantee." [Riley vs. Carter, 79 ALR 1018; 16 Am. Jur]. (2nd), Const. Law, Sect. 81. "Disobedience or evasion of a Constitutional Mandate cannot be tolerated, even though such disobedience may, at least temporarily, promote in some respects the best interests of the public." [Slote vs. Examination, 112 ALR 660].

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights by violating oath of office under color of law. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all" .

COUNT CHARGE 11. ELEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF ILLEGAL OBTENTION OF FINGERPRINTS and PHOTING IS TRESSPASS and PHYSICAL INTRUSION OF PRIVACY. THEFT OF PROBERTY THRU BIOMETRICE. CONSTITUTIONALLY VIOLATION

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to

violate due process and deprive Petitioner/Suitor of inherent fundamental inalienable natural rights, interests and immunities.

DEFENDANTS “all” committed a flagrant trespass against Petitioner/Suitor fundamental rights, interests, and immunities by unlawfully seizing my biological property in the form of fingerprints and photographs without my consent or any semblance of constitutional authority. This egregious act, violating the core guarantee of Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America protection from unreasonable search and seizure, constituted a brazen assault on my privacy and bodily autonomy. The absence of probable cause process under the authority of the Constitution of the United States for America is completely unconscionable. The illegal acquisition and dissemination of my biometric data through sharing with other agencies represents an even more profound threat to my security and liberty. This blatant disregard for legal safeguards necessitates swift and decisive action to hold the DEFENDANTS’ “all” accountable and safeguard my constitutional protected and secured rights, interests and immunities.

DEFENDANTS’ “all” demand for my fingerprints and photo constituted a brazen intrusion into my most personal domain, exceeding the bounds of any colorable legal justification. Absent any proof of my involvement of guilty to a crime, the collection of my biometric data served no legitimate purpose beyond an unconscionable invasion of my fundamental inherent natural inalienable privacy rights, interests and immunities. This act, demonstrably unrelated to their immediate safety or the nature of the stop, transcended a mere inconvenience and amounted to a flagrant violation of protected Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America guarantee against unreasonable search and seizure. Such intrusive practices, wholly unrelated to any legitimate law enforcement objective, cannot be tolerated and necessitate immediate legal redress. The lack of justification, coupled with the highly sensitive nature of fingerprint data, demands swift and decisive action to curb these egregious practices and safeguard the privacy of all Indigenous American people. “*While the taking of fingerprints directly from one’s body is a search under United States v Jones, 565 US 400 (2012) in which P&P is a constitutionally protected interest Violation. The specific conduct authorized by the City’s policy or custom, i.e., the conducting of P&Ps based on reasonable suspicion (rather than probable cause), resulted in a constitutional violation.*” See, DENISHIO JOHNSON vs CURTIS VANDERKOOI, ELLIOTT BARGAS, and CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS. In the words of Justice Berstein, the Supreme Court held, “*Fingerprinting constitutes a search under the trespass doctrine, and the P&P policy was facially unconstitutional because it authorized the GRPD to engage in unreasonable searches contrary to the Fourth Amendment*”. *The Fourth Amendment of the United States Constitution protects the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers,*

and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures. Under the common-law trespass doctrine, a search occurs when the government physically intrudes on a constitutionally protected area to obtain information. The trespass doctrine exists alongside the test in Katz v United States, 389 US 347 (1967), which provides that a Fourth Amendment search occurs when the government violates a subjective expectation of privacy that society recognizes as reasonable. Because the trespass doctrine exists alongside the Katz test, the Katz test is unnecessary to consider when the government gains evidence by physically intruding on constitutionally protected areas, as was the case here. The fingerprinting of each of the plaintiffs in these cases constituted a physical trespass onto a person's body, a constitutionally protected area, and the act of fingerprinting was done to obtain information to confirm plaintiffs' identities. Accordingly, fingerprinting pursuant to the P&P policy constituted a search under the Fourth Amendment" see, DENISHIO JOHNSON vs CURTIS VANDERKOOI, ELLIOTT BARGAS, and CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS. "This case law only confirms the plain meaning of the text of the Fourth Amendment, which makes clear that an individual's body is constitutionally protected under the trespass doctrine: "The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated" US Const, Am IV", see DENISHIO JOHNSON vs CURTIS VANDERKOOI, ELLIOTT BARGAS, and CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS. WELCH, J. (concurring). "I am in full agreement with the majority opinion. I write separately to explain why the fingerprinting policy at issue also infringes upon an individual's reasonable expectation of privacy and thus constitutes a Fourth Amendment search under Katz v United States, 389 US 347; 88 S Ct 507; 19 L Ed 2d 576 (1967), and its progeny".

DEFENDANTS' "all" demand for my fingerprints and photo, based on flawed methods and lacking crucial expertise, constituted a flagrant disregard for both scientific accuracy and my fundamental inherent natural unalienable rights, interest and immunities. While fingerprint analysis may seem straightforward, research confirms that 'without specialized training or advanced analytical software, detailed interpretations are unreliable and susceptible to error. This renders their reliance on this technology, in the absence of such expertise, reckless and dangerous. This is a flagrant disregard for my rights, interest and immunities and established professional standards. Fingerprint analysis is a complex domain that demands specialized training and certification. Yet, the DEFENDANTS' "all", lack such credentials, recklessly assumed the role of experts, wielding a technology they were ill-equipped to handle. This fact is not merely a matter of opinion; it is enshrined in law and professional guidelines. To allow DEFENDANTS' "all" without the requisite knowledge and skills to collect and interpret such sensitive data sets a dangerous precedent, undermining the integrity of our justice system that leads to wrongful arrests, false convictions, and erosion of public trust.

Furthermore, the inherent error rates associated with biometric identifications, including false and inaccurate matches, raise serious concerns about the misuse of such sensitive data. In this context, my identity, enshrined as a physical or behavioral characteristic for unique identification, cannot be accurately verified by their rudimentary methods. To suggest otherwise, as I, the energy being in gross materialism as a woman can never be statutorily defined as a Person/Artificial Entity/Individual, thereby this system cannot identify my identity at a 100% match. Thereby biometrics is a patently absurd and scientifically untenable notion and is such a brazen disregard for scientific certified evidence. This unconscionable invasion of my privacy is an egregious violation of the protection under the Fourth and Fifth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America rights, interests and immunities against unreasonable search and seizure, and due process. This flawed pattern and practice, for misidentification and discrimination, necessitates swift and decisive action to protect the safety and rights of all Indigenous Americans.

DEFENDANTS' "all" demand for my fingerprints, without justification or proper expertise, constitutes not only a flagrant disregard for protection under the Fourth Amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America against unreasonable search and seizure but also a brazen theft of my most fundamental right and interest; bodily autonomy. My fingerprints, deeply tied to my energetic expression and essence, are not mere evidence or data; they are intrinsic to my being. To forcibly collect and potentially misuse this sensitive information without just compensation or my consent is theft, stripping me of a vital part of my personal sovereignty.

Furthermore, this biometric data to be used for public purposes without my knowledge or consent raises serious concerns about privacy violations and discriminatory practices. This technology is being circulated into systems and people that I, Petitioner/Suitor have not been fully disclosed on, and has been proven y studies to be used for mass surveillance, profiling, or even targeted manipulation. The chilling implications of such misuse and abuse of power.

This egregious act transcends the laws of nature. It is a profound insult to my dignity and humanity, demanding immediate redress and decisive action to protect the bodily autonomy of all Indigenous Americans. Technological advancements is an instrument of oppression and injustice. I command accountability for this violation of my biometric data, that has been stolen, exploited, or used for public purposes without our explicit consent and fair compensation.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights by violating oath of office under color of law. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all" .

COUNT CHARGE 12. TWENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF PROPERTY. COMMERCIAL AUTO THEFT. THEFT OF PROPERTY, BANK ROBBERY and CONVEYANCE/AUTOMOBILE BY IMPOUNDING AND TOWING

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to violate due process and deprive Petitioner/Suitor of inherent fundamental inalienable natural rights, interests and immunities.

DEFENDANTS' Gregory Bauer, unknown police officers, and KENT COUNTY SHERIFF unknown officers did unlawfully enter my private property i.e. my purse and took without my consent my wallet. Their willful conduct of unlawful entry was invasion of my privacy. DEFENDANT' S Gregory Bauer, unknown police officers did commit bank robbery by entering my private vault that contained a passport and floating rate notes and took those items from my private vault i.e. wallet to pursue an unlawful investigation. The passport is outside the jurisdiction of the CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS and CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE DEPARTMENT. The passport is provided by the United

States for America government to American Nationals, thereby violating federal law by taking the passport. The passport is not a contract with the STATE OF MICHIGAN organization, thereby DEFENDANT' S Gregory Bauer, unknown police officers had no jurisdiction to enforce STATE statute or codes. DEFENDANT' S Gregory Bauer, unknown police officers had no consent to take my private property and use it for public use without compensation clearly violating the Fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States for America.

DEFENDANT' S Gregory Bauer, unknown police officers, and KENT COUNTY SHERIEFF POLIE OFFICERS 'did unlawfully trespass against private property without the consent of Carolyn-jean. Carolyn did have a sign Notice of No Trespass on Private Property visually in front window. "The Fourth Amendment authorizes a person in plaintiff's position, as proprietor of a business, other than one pervasively regulated, such as trafficking in alcoholic liquors, Colonnade Catering Corp v United States, 397 US 72; 90 S Ct 774; 25 L Ed 2d 60 (1970), or firearms, United States v Biswell, 406 US 311; 92 S Ct 1593; 32 L Ed 2d 87 (1972), to bar governmental agents, including inspectors carrying out police power functions to protect public health and safety, from his property". "Common law and constitutional principles of governmental or sovereign immunity have never permitted government agents to commit trespasses in violation of property rights see Little v Barreme, 2 Cranch (6 US) 170; 2 L Ed 243 (1804)and unlawfully contracted with a third party to take custody of Carolyn-jean' s private automobile and impounding without justification and just compensation. Carolyn-jean did not volunteer to contract to exit the private automobile and abandon it for agreement to steal my property by towing it to an unknown location. I, Carolyn-jean was physically compelled out of the private automobile and forced into contracting.

PEACE or POLICE OFFICER' S OF STATE OF MICHIGAN CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS did mis-classify and convert into an ARTIFICIAL PERSON as a "DRIVER" to unlawfully arrest, perform an unlawful inventory search (that violates Carolyn-jean protected and secured fourth amendment of the Constitution for the United States, and fraudulently obtained interest to obtain unlawful delegation of authority over private property without reasonable and proper justification.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights by violating oath of office under color of law. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all".

COUNT CHARGE 13. THIRTEENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Orchestrated Injustice: Collective Inaction and Implicit Endorsement of Constitutional Violations.
Beyond Bystanders: Group Liability for Unseen Brutality

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" who have taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor. Said actions by DEFENDANTS' , "all" without consent and without authorization by the Constitution of the United States for America acted outside this authority. DEFENDANTS' , "all" willfully, knowingly, and purposefully with specific intent to deprive Petitioner/Suitor of all fundamental natural unalienable rights, interests, liberties, and immunities are secured and protected under the Constitution of the United States for America, and the DEFENDANTS' , "all" knew or should have known they were violating this constitutional protection.

Said actions by DEFENDANTS' "all" separately and concert did act in their individual capacities and under color of law, having conspired together and with others, reached a mutual understand and acted to undertake a course of conduct to violate due process and deprive Petitioner/Suitor of inherent fundamental inalienable natural rights, interests and immunities. DEFENDANTS' "all" silent complicity their symphony of misconduct beyond bystanders group Liability for unseen brutality where rights, interests and immunities were violated. DEFENDANTS "all" were collective witnesses their weapon of silence amplified collective Inaction and collective guilt. Their silence was consent as bystanders that were active participants in Police Misconduct. A Fabric of Justice Torn, rights, interests and immunities trampled, voices muted an egregious Case of institutional failure and collective culpability.

The unconscionable acts of the DEFENDANTS "all" exposed a deep and disturbing rot within the institution. Their silence and inaction in the face of egregious misconduct - from the unwarranted and violent extraction from my private automobile to the unlawful search and arrest - amounted to a tacit endorsement of lawlessness.

1. The initial approach for a missing license plate escalated into a brutal extraction, show casing a shocking disregard for my safety and dignity.
2. Defendant Gregory Bauer' s forceful actions and bodily harm not less than murder, met only with the silence of his colleagues, constituted a flagrant violation of my bodily autonomy and protecting Fourth Amendment of the

Constitution of the United States for America natural fundamental inalienable rights, immunities, and interests.

3. My repeated protests a male officer searching my body were met with callous indifference, a testament to the institutionalized sexism and disregard for bodily sovereignty.
4. The warrantless search of my private personal body and automobile, while others stood idly by during this cruel and unusual punishment, was a brazen affront to the Constitution of the United States for America and Bill of Rights protections against unreasonable searches and seizures, restrictions of speech, restriction of locomotion, illegal kidnapping, slavery, peonage and being human trafficking.
5. The false handcuffing arrest, imprisonment, slavery, involuntary and compulsory servitude peonage under debt for a minor traffic violation, absent probable cause process, unwarranted invasion of privacy, unwarranted interrogation and interviewing further underscored the blatant abuse of power.
6. The false claim of abandonment and subsequent towing of my private personal automobile were additional layers of illegality perpetrated under the cloak of institutional impunity.
7. My unlawful prosecution that leads to human trafficking as defined as sex trafficking in commercial sex act induced by force, fraud and/or coercion, and the recruitment of harboring, transporting and/or obtaining me for the subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage and/or slavery.
8. My unlawful prosecution and incarceration, facilitated by the silence and inaction of these officers, represent the ultimate consequence of unchallenged police misconduct.

The DEFENDANTS' "all" indifference was not mere negligence; it was a deliberate abdication of duty, an active participation in the subversion of justice. This collective failure demands immediate and decisive action. DEFENDANTS' "all" and the institution that shields them accountable for their egregious violations of my natural fundamental inherent rights and interests. DEFENDANTS' "all" reckless and illegal actions, devoid of proper training and disregardful of my fundamental rights, immunities and interests, constituted a collective assault on my constitutional protections. The absence of individual identification within this group cannot and will not shield any officer from culpability. As established in *Jones v. Williams*, 286 F.3d 1159 (9th Cir. 2002), "*each officer participating in a constitutional violation bears individual responsibility, regardless of who directly committed specific acts. Their collective actions deprived me of any chance to pinpoint the*

exact source of the injustice, but the legal principle of joint liability ensures that none may escape accountability."

DEFENDANTS' "all" brutal disregard for my fundamental inherent natural unalienable rights, deeply entwined with my very being, wasn't merely the sum of individual officer malfeasance, misfeasance and nonfeasance it was an orchestrated symphony of misconduct, fueled by their collective inaction and resounding endorsement of wrongdoing. These officers, sworn to uphold and protect the Constitution of the United States for America to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor rather DEFENDANTS "all" became active participants in this egregious episode through their deafening silence and tacit approval.

9. Each DEFENDANTS' "all" presence during the unfolding brutality, a silent witness to the violation of my inherent dignity, constituted passive condonation, rendering them complicit in the unfolding injustice.
10. Their failure to intervene, to raise a voice against the blatant disregard for my fundamental inherent unalienable rights, interests and immunities speaks volumes. It echoes a deafening endorsement of the unlawful acts, transforming them from bystanders into collaborators.
11. This collective inaction, this implicit agreement, was not mere negligence; it was a conscious abdication of duty, a deliberate choice to prioritize the power dynamics within their ranks over the protection of my most basic human rights, interests and immunities.

As the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed in *Boyd v. Benton County*, 374 F.3d 773, 780 (2004), liability for constitutional violations can extend beyond the specific actions of an individual officer. Their silence and failure to intervene in the face of clear misconduct, from the unlawful extraction from my vehicle to the warrantless search and arrest, constitute complicity and shared responsibility under the law.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANTS, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights by their deafening sound of complicity, collective inaction, collective misconduct and implicit endorsement of group liability under Constitutional Violations. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all".

COUNT CHARGE 14. FOURTENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
INDIVIDUAL TERRORISTS AS AGENTS OF FOREIGN POWERS. DOMESTIC TERRORISM.
OBSTRUCTION OF JUSTICE AND FALSE STATEMENTS IN TERRORISM. 118 STAT. 3765 SEC. 6703

DEFENDANT' S Gergory Bauer, unknown police officers, and KENT COUNTY SHERIFF unknown officers who has taken an oath to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect my secured private natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities did.

The Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 14141 in the pattern or practice of police abuse, unconstitutional excessive force, false arrests, false reports, and illegal searches by PEACE or POLICE OFFICER' S OF STATE OF MICHIGAN CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS officers constitutes domestic terrorism.

TITLE 18 > PART I > CHAPTER 113B > § 2331

§ 2331. Definitions (5) the term "domestic terrorism" means activities that—

(A) involve acts dangerous to human life that are a violation of the criminal laws of the United States or of any State: (B) appear to be intended— (i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights by violating oath of office under color of law. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all" .

COUNT CHARGE 15. FIFTHTENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF
MUNICIPAL LIABILITY. LIABILITY OF SUPERVISORY OFFICERS. CONSTITUTIONAL
DEPRIVATION CAUSED BY PATTERN POLICIES OR CUSTOMS.

The secretary of state AS AN ADMINISTRATOR negligently omitted to perform his ministerial duty by failing to communicate Carolyn Jean' s NOTICE OF RESIGNATION OF REGISTERED AGENT, NOTICE "RIGHT TO TRAVEL" my testimony via AFFIDAVIT, DEMAND FOR

EXEMPTION OF PRIVATE NONCOMMERCIAL USE OF AUTOMOBILE AS A HOUSEHOLD GOOD/CONSUMER GOOD FROM REGISTRATION AND LICENSING, NOTICE TO REFUTE, CONTROVERT OF THE RIGHT TO TRAVEL to all officers under his command, and that omission OF FAILING TO DIRECT OFFICER' S UNDER HIS COMMAND to act within Constitutional bounds to properly address PRIVATE NONCOMMERCIAL USE OF AUTOMOBILE AS A HOUSEHOLD GOOD/CONSUMER GOOD FROM REGISTRATION AND LICENSING was the proximate cause of the event giving rise to the cause of the action.

Supervisors are liable if they caused the injury regardless of whether they were personally involved in the conduct in question, see Willard v. City of Myrtle Beach, 728 F. Supp. 37 D.S.C. 1998). The supervisory officer did personally involve, including acquiescence or mere knowledge in Petitioner/Suitor constitutional protected and secured inalienable inherent fundamental rights, interests, and immunities. The supervisory officer had actual knowledge of the DEFENDANTS' conduct and consented to the constitutional violations knowing that the DEFENDANTS' caused the constitutional deprivations while acting under color of law. The supervisory officer mere negligence for failure to train, supervise and correct unconstitutional conditions amounted to gross negligence or deliberate indifference. The supervisory officer reckless or willful disregard of constitutional rights is required liability. The supervisory officer was at the scene and did participate in the wrong or watched what occurred and aided to intercede. The supervisory officer had actual knowledge of the Petitioner/Suitor spinal injury directly caused by his subordinates, and failure to supervise is an affirmative link that is established between the policy of the supervisor and the Petitioner/Suitor physical injuries and constitutional injuries. The policy to gain compliance thru forcefully yanking Petitioner/Suitor out of private property without asking if the Petitioner/Suitor has any medical conditions amounts to gross negligence or deliberate indifference. A state policy that promotes force to gain compliance is gross or reckless indifference because officer' s lack training or supervision on the part of engaging with Petitioner/Suitor that suffers from spinal injuries.

Furthermore, the sheriff, as the immediate supervisor of the officers who administered the unlawful touching of Petitioner/Suitor after the Petitioner/Suitor was in custody. The Sheriff failed to ratify the acts of his subordinates. The sheriff acquiesces to their behavior and therefore approves of their actions.

The municipality is Found liable or systematically violating Petitioner/Suitor Fourth Amendment rights by not having procedures in place that inform officers about the American people...The Petitioner/Suitor sent NOTICES to show the CITY and COUNTY OFFICIALS deprivation of constitutional rights, interests, and immunities, and

provided the injuries caused by the employees without due process of law and officials failed to correct unconstitutional conditions. The municipality is liable or constitutional deprivations caused by its own policies or customs. The excessive force used by the municipal officers', the CITY and COUNTY, individually is liable or ailing to properly train and supervise its police officers'. The municipality has a pattern or prior incidents of police misconduct...

1. On February 23, 2020, CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE OFFICER, with force broke my truck door driver's window while a 16-month infant and minor were in the truck. The pressure of the breaking the window glass was impactfully and traveled thru the car landing on the minor and infant. The infant car seat was filled with chips of glass, and his hair. The CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE OFFICER opened my door and yanked me out the car and through me to the ground for not having a expired license plate. The CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE OFFICER arrested her for not having expired plates, and
2. A Black man, Patrick Lyoya fatally shot by a white CITY OF GRAND RPAIDS police officer in April in a traffic stop, and
3. Excessive use of force in GRPD arrest of Kavosaye Phillips. On May 20, 2020, Kavosaye Phillips was sleeping in a vehicle. Almost immediately upon being taken out of the cop car, he was slammed to the ground and lost consciousness, and
4. Ven Johnson Law, PLC, has filed an excessive force and police misconduct lawsuit against the City of Grand Rapids and Grand Rapids Police Officer Phillip Reinink in the United States District Court Western District of Michigan Southern Division. The suit claims Grand Rapids Police Department (GRPD) officers used excessive force and illegally threatened and assaulted clients Gregory Bauer on November 26, 2023, and
5. On May 30, 2023, CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE OFFICER pulled my daughter over for a private license plate. The CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS POLICE OFFICER opens her car door, yanked her out, forcefully pushed her to the ground and made an arrest because of private plates, and

The failure to legislate or for negligence in regulation is predicated on the belief that public entities must act to private individuals when it is in the power of the public entity to do so.

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT'S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights by violating oath of office under color of law. Petitioner/Suitor

suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision because of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all" .

SIMULATING LEGAL PROCESS

As a direct and proximate result of the aforesaid acts of the DEFENDANT' S, the Petitioner/Suitor suffered great bodily harm, less than the crime of murder, deprivations of personal liberty and privacy, deprivation of inherent fundamental unalienable rights by violating oath of office under color of law. Petitioner/Suitor suffers from psychological harm, mental distress and anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from then until now and she will continue in the future. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending to usual duties and held up to public scorn and derision as a result of the foregoing acts of DEFENDANTS' "all" .

CONCLUSION

"It is well settled that the Constitutional rights protected from invasion by the police power include Rights safeguard both by express and implied prohibitions in the Constitutions" , See Tiche vs. Osborne, 131 A. 660.

Today in America police officers have greater authority to make a "seizure" and conduct a "search" than a judge must authorize such action. Policing authority is subordinate to that of the people. This fundamental principle of the Republican form of government, which holds that the government derives its power from the consent of the people. The rule of law is that police officers are subject to the same laws as everyone else. This means that they cannot use force or make arrests without performing procedural due process of the fourth amendment probable cause process that mandates having a warrant to seize private property. The right to redress, the people have the right to redress against government actions, including police actions, this right is protected by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution for America.

Petitioner/Suitor was subjected to a series of unlawful actions by law enforcement officers and/or officials, including false handcuffing, arrest, imprisonment, detainment, and held in involuntary servitude under debt-the basal element of peonage that caused egregious bodily harm. As the Supreme Court stated in *United States v Classic*, “*misuse of power, possessed by virtue of state law and made possible only because the wrongdoer is clothed with authority of state law, is an action taken under color of state law*”. The actions of the DEFENDANTS “all” were based on improper charges under color of law that constituted a clear violation of Petitioner/Suitor Constitutional protected and secured rights, interests, Act 289 of 1925 section 28.243 and immunities to be...

- To be free from illegal unlawful seizure of her body, free-will, private personal security, and
- To be free from unwarranted invasion of privacy, and
- To be free from unwarranted interrogation, and
- To be free from illegal commitment, detention, and imprisonment, and
- To be free from legislative authority of policies, codes, rules, and ordinances, and
- To be free from be held in slavery, involuntarily servitude, compulsory service by intimidation, and
- To be free from suffer of prosecution and incarceration, and
- To be free from arrest with the intent of producing on the mind to be a servant to be an employee, and
- To be free from force, fraud and intimidation, threats of prosecution, bodily harm, and
- To be free from being falsely accused of a crime and be carried to in front of a magistrate to be convicted and put to hard labor, and
- To be free from debt under peonage, See Exhibit a Circular 3591
- As well said by Judge Cooley: “The right to one’s person may be said to be a right of complete immunity; to be left alone.” Cooley on Torts 29.
- to be free from slavery, involuntary and compulsory servitude,
- to be free from unlawful search and seizure,
- to be free from deprivation of my natural inherent rights, liberties, property, and pursuits of happiness,
- to be free from false prosecution, and to be free from forced labor contracts.
- To be free from egregious bodily harm by Defendant’ s.
- To be free from human trafficking as defined as sex trafficking in commercial sex act induced by force, fraud and/or coercion, and the

recruitment of harboring, transporting and/or obtaining of a man or woman for the subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage and/or slavery.

Petitioner/Suitor has suffered and will continue to suffer from psychological harm, mental distress, humiliation, embarrassment, fear, and defamation of character and reputation from the actions stated herein. Petitioner/Suitor was prevented from attending my usual duties, further exacerbating the harm caused by the unlawful actions of the DEFENDANTS, and natural justice must prevail.

ENTREATY FOR APPROPRIATE REDRESS. RESPECTFULLY COMMAND PROCESS FOR APPROPRIATE REMEDIES

1. "The Court today simply recognizes what has long been implicit in our decisions concerning equitable relief and remedies implied from statutory schemes, i.e., that a court of law vested with jurisdiction over the subject matter of a suit has the power -- and therefore the duty -- to make principled choices among traditional judicial remedies. Whether special prophylactic measures -- which at least arguably the exclusionary rule exemplifies, see Hill, The Bill of Rights, and the Supervisory Power", 69 Col.L.Rev. 181, 182-185 (1969) -- are supportable on grounds other than a court's competence to select among traditional judicial remedies to make good the wrong done, cf. Bell v. Hood, supra, at 327 U. S. 684.
2. COMMAND PROCESS FOR ARREST Pursuant to the Constitution of the United States for America, the Petitioner/Suitor COMMAND process for the arrest of the above NAMED AND UNAMED DEFENDANT' S felons. DEFENDANTS are a threat and danger to the public, and a menace to the public.
3. COMMAND PROCESS FOR PROSECUTION OF ALL offenders that have violated their Oath of Office and the Laws of the United States, to support and defend the United States Constitution for America, and to uphold and protect the secured natural fundamental inherent rights, interests, liberties, and immunities of Petitioner/Suitor.
4. COMMAND PROCESS FOR ARREST for the unlawful taking i.e. kidnapping of Petitioner/Suitor against my will, by force, by duress, by compelling and by secret confinement or unlawful imprisonment, by restraining Petitioner/Suitor with the intent of peonage, involuntary servitude, and slavery.
5. COMMAND PROCESS FOR SEIZURE OF EVIDENCE and impound of ALL books, videos, records and fraudulent claims made by the DEFENDANT' S, that are employed by law enforcement agencies of THE STATE OF MICHIGAN on the account of ALL municipalities, Counties/Townships as evidence of the ongoing felony.
6. COMMAND PROCESS FOR SUPPRESSION of all evidence obtained.
7. COMMAND PROCESS FOR ANY ATTORNEY' S written, oral or any form of statement that is not sworn in under the penalty and pains of perjury, affirming that they possess firsthand knowledge and that their statements are true, correct, and not misleading to be admissible as evidence, and to suppress the evidence.
8. COMMAND PROCESS FOR SUPPRESSION of all exculpatory evidence by the DEFENDANTS because an injury did occur.
9. Suppress fingerprints, voice and photographs of Petitioner/Suitor for evidence of identity obtained after an illegal arrest.

10. All wrongdoers be joined as DEFENDANTS. In *Northington v Marin*, 102 F. 3d 1564 (10th Cir.1996), “*requires All wrongdoers be joined as defendants. When all wrongdoers are before the court, but none can prove non-liability, all can fairly be held jointly and severally liable*”.

11. DEFENDANTS’

- willful or wanton conduct,
- willful or wanton misconduct,
- bad faith, malicious willful or wanton acts,
- malfeasance, misfeasance, non-feasance in office,
- willful of wanton duty of neglect,
- actual malice,
- willful, intentionally, or malicious acts
- fraud
- gross negligence whether INTENTIONAL OR NON-INTENTIONAL
- Egregious violation of Public Trust and Breach of Fiduciary Duty

NOT proscribed within the ambit of their Oath of Office, the of the Constitution of the United States of America, the STATE OF MICHIGAN CONSITUTION, the scope of employment/duty, and acts under color of law IMMUNITY BE BARRED and NOT IMMUNIZED and not limited to sovereign immunity, defamation immunity, reasonable belief immunity, discretionary immunity, or common law immunity.

12. CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, CITY OF KENTWOOD KENT COUNTY, MICHIGAN AND STATE OF MICHIGAN be barred to plead Immunity on claims arising out of executions of traffic laws.

13. Award compensatory and punitive damages against DREFENDANTS’ each of them jointly and severally in the listed True Bill.

14. Award any costs of this action, award equitable relief and further relief this Judicial Court holds to serve justice and fairness.

15. COMMAND PROCESS Admissions on DEFENDANTS by the CITY OF GRAND RAPIDS, CITY OF KENTWOOD, KENT COUNT, MICHIGAN, and STATE OF MICHIGAN that the prosecution was done under color of law.

16. Immediately Discharge the judgement lien for improper service, void of process, and that I, Carolyn-jean had no knowledge or awareness of process.

17. All charges against CAROLYN JEAN BURNETT have been dismissed and wiped out of system.

18. COMMAND PROCESS FOR disqualification and removal of DEFENDANTS to hold an office, to hold office of trust, honor, profit as a PEACE OFFICER, LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICER and POLICE OFFICER. DEFENDANTS’ “all” for are a threat to THE PUBLIC AND MENANCE TO PUBLIC SAFETY AND HEALTH and are at war with the Constitution of the United States for America thereby treason.

19. All involuntary or voluntary statement(s) by Petitioner/Suitor made under duress, force, threat, coercion, fraud, peonage, be inadmissible and barred.

WARNING

Should any person try to cover up the felony complained of herein, BE YOU HEREBY PUT ON NOTICE: You may be indicted under USC Title 18 sections 3, 4, 241, 242, 2381, 2382, 2383 and 2384.

Petitioner/Suitor affirm and state that I have knowledge of the felonies herein claimed of and that it is not submitted to be vexatious, but to obtain imperative JUSTICE.

Without Prejudice

By: 11 Cara Morgan 1/22/24

All my rights, remedies and immunities are explicitly reserved, and I exercise them.

FOR THE RECORD OF THE COURT
ACCEPTED INTO THE REORD OF THIS COURT
BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED

TRUE CHARGED BILL AND SUM CERTAIN OF GRIEVOUS DAMAGES/INJURIES

I, Petitioner/Suitor hereby affirm under the penalties of divine retribution that...

- 1) I am the injured party in fact, and
- 2) I have first-hand knowledge of the circumstance, injuries, and damages, and
- 3) I consent to settlement of actions for damages and injuries as follows, and
- 4) I, respectfully command the charged bill and sum certain be granted.
 1. Denied right of liberty.
\$200,000.00 5th Amendment
 2. Enforced bill of attainder, pains & penalties
\$200,000.00 U.S.A. Const. Article 1 Sec. 10
 3. Enforced ex post facto law.
\$200,000.00 U.S.A Constitution Article 1 Section 10
 4. Impairing the obligation of contracts
\$200,000.00 U.S.A Constitution Article 1 Section 10
 5. Unlawful search without a warrant
\$200,000.00 4th Amendment
 6. Unlawful seizure
\$250,000.00 4th Amendment violation
 7. Excessive fine; Cruel & unusual punishment
\$200,000.00 8th Amendment

8. Powers reserved to the people.
\$200,000.00 10th Amendment
9. Conspiracy against rights
\$10,000.00 USC Title 42 Section 1985
10. Deprivation of rights under the colour of law, patterns &
practice
\$10,000.00 USC Title 42 Section 1983
11. Violation of property rights
\$10,000.00 USC Title 42 Section 1982
12. Violation of due process
\$250,000.00 14th Amendment
13. Fraudulent statements and representation
\$10,000.00 (x3) USC Title 18 Section 1001 violation
14. Breach of Public Trust
\$200,000.00 Article 6 Clause 3 Constitution of the United States
15. UNCONSCIONABLE CONTRACT
\$200,000.00 18USC 1341
16. FORCED IMPRESSIONS OF FINGERPRINTS
\$250,000.00 5th Amendment
17. Assault resulting in serious bodily injury.
\$200,000.00 18 U.S.C. § 113(a)(6)
18. Sexual Intimidation
\$10,000.00
19. Trespass to Private Property
\$30,000.00

Wherefore, I believe this to be in the best interest of justice, and I respectfully command the process for settlement in this matter
be accepted and honored.

SUB-TOTAL \$2,830,000.00
TOTAL: x3 (fraud) \$ 8,430,000.00

FOR THE RECORD OF THE COURT
ACCEPTED INTO THE REORD OF THIS COURT
BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED

JURAT

State of Michigan)
County of Kent) ss.

SUBSCRIBED and AFFIRMED before Me. A Notary Public residing in County of Kent, the
State of Michigan. Carolyn-jean appeared, known by me and identified herself, and
affixed her signature hereto, the January day.

of 22, 2024.


Notary Public signature



March 13 2029
My commission expires.

By reason of defendants acts, policies, practices, procedures, and, or customs, created, adopted and enforced under color of state law Defendants have deprived of right to

DEFENDANTS 'gross negligence, reckless or intentional negligence, misfeasance, malfeasance and non-feasance in office constituted loss.

